



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015



FATHERS' RECREATION ROOM
PLEASE DO NOT TAKE TO
PRIVATE BOOKS

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

JUNE, 1965

THE 1965 JEA

NATIONAL MEETING

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

Vol. XXVIII, No. 1

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

LC
493
.J45

Our Contributors

FATHER EDMOND J. SMYTH (California Prov.) Dean of the College of Liberal Arts at the University of San Francisco, is Director of the forthcoming Workshop of Academic Deans to be held at USF the summer of 1965.

FATHER LEO P. McLAUGHLIN (New York Prov.) formerly Dean of Arts at St. Peter's College, was recently read in as Rector at St. Peter's. He is a member of the Planning Committee of the Academic Deans' Workshop.

FATHER JOHN R. VIGNEAU (New England Prov.) is Principal of Xavier High, Concord, Mass.

FATHER JOSEPH T. BROWNE (New York Prov.) is Province Director of Education for High Schools.

FATHER CORNELIUS J. CARR (Buffalo Prov.) is Province Director of Education for High Schools.

FATHER HERBERT A. MUSURILLO (New York Prov.) is Professor of Classics at Fordham University.

FATHER EUGENE J. O'BRIEN (New York Prov.) is the writer of the tribute to Father Arthur Shea. Father O'Brien is the present Principal of the Prep and the last in line of the ten principals who have served "under" Father Shea.

FATHER WILLIAM D. RYAN (Missouri Prov.) is Province Director of Education for the Missouri Province.

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

370226

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

June, 1965

CONTENTS

THE 1965 JEA NATIONAL MEETING	
<i>Eugene F. Mangold, S.J.</i>	5
THE LIBERAL ARTS CORE CURRICULUM OF THE SIXTIES	
<i>Edmond J. Smyth, S.J.</i>	7
PROJECT MODELS OF LIBERAL ARTS PROGRAM	
<i>Leo P. McLaughlin, S.J.</i>	21
JESUIT SECONDARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM	
<i>John R. Vigneau, S.J.</i>	27
MONDAY MORNING SESSION (APRIL 19) OF JEA	
HIGH SCHOOL DELEGATES	
<i>Joseph T. Browne, S.J.</i>	38
MONDAY AFTERNOON SESSION (APRIL 19) OF JEA	
HIGH SCHOOL DELEGATES	
<i>Cornelius J. Carr, S.J.</i>	42
A CITATION TO REVEREND ARTHUR V. SHEA, S.J.	46
THE MEANING OF A LIBERAL EDUCATION IN OUR TIMES	
<i>Herbert Musurillo, S.J.</i>	49
IS THERE ANYTHING DISTINCTIVE ABOUT JESUIT EDUCATION?	
<i>William D. Ryan, S.J.</i>	58
NEWS FROM THE FIELD	61

THE JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY, published in June, October, January, and March by the Jesuit Educational Association, represents the Jesuit secondary schools, colleges, seminaries, and universities of the United States, and those conducted by American Jesuits in foreign lands.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor

EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.

Assistant Editor

PAUL A. FITZGERALD, S.J.

Managing Editor

EUGENE F. MANGOLD, S.J.

Advisory Board

An editorial advisory board is composed of the regional directors of education in the several Jesuit provinces:

JOSEPH T. BROWNE, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
JAMES L. BURKE, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
CORNELIUS J. CARR, S.J.	<i>Buffalo Province</i>
BERNARD J. DOOLEY, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JOSEPH K. DRANE, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JAMES E. FITZGERALD, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
HERMAN J. HAUCK, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
ADRIAN J. KOCHANSKI, S.J.	<i>Wisconsin Province</i>
JOHN V. MURPHY, S.J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>
LORENZO K. REED, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
WILLIAM D. RYAN, S.J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
PAUL V. SIEGFRIED, S.J.	<i>Detroit Province</i>
JOHN F. SULLIVAN, S.J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>
JAMES F. WHELAN, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR

49 East 84th Street, New York, N.Y. 10028

COPYRIGHT, 1965

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

The 1965 JEA National Meeting

EUGENE F. MANGOLD, S.J.

Some three-hundred JEA delegates assembled at Fordham University in New York City on Easter Sunday and Monday, April 18 and 19, 1965 to attend the sessions of the 1965 JEA National Meeting. The number of delegates was the largest that has ever attended a JEA meeting. It might be noted that this was the first of the National Meetings to be held by the JEA. Previously under the directives of the 1948 JEA Constitution an Annual Meeting of the JEA was to be held each year. Operating under the revised rulings of the 1964 JEA Constitution "The Association will hold national meetings at intervals to be determined by the Coordinating Committee and approved by the Board of Governors."

The opening sessions of the 1965 Meeting were held on Easter Sunday evening with key-note addresses to separate sessions of the delegates of higher education and to the delegates of the secondary schools. Morning and afternoon sessions on Easter Monday were devoted to the ramification and discussion of the key-note addresses. The 1965 National Meeting concluded with a dinner meeting and address to all the assembled delegates.

The general theme of the 1965 Meeting was the Curriculum of the Sixties as it referred specifically to the Liberal Arts College and to the secondary school. In one way, it was a looking forward and a looking backward since the higher education delegates were discussing matters that will be treated more fully at the August 1965 Workshop of Liberal Arts Deans and the secondary school delegates were looking backward to the developments arising from the August 1964 Santa Clara Institute for Administrators of Secondary Schools.

The Easter Sunday evening session of the delegates of higher education heard two key-note papers: Father Edmond J. Smyth, S.J., Dean of Liberal Arts at the University of San Francisco and Director of the August 1965 Workshop of Liberal Arts Deans spoke on the "The Workshop of Liberal Arts Deans, August, 1965" and Father Leo P. McLaughlin, S.J., Dean of Arts at St. Peter's College spoke on "Project Models of Liberal Arts Programs." On Easter Monday the Liberal Arts delegates held ten individual sessions wherein previously appointed Committees worked on planning

position papers to be presented at the August 1965 Workshop. Individual sessions were held on the following general areas: Communication, Language and Linguistics, Literature, History, Fine Arts, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, Mathematics, Philosophy, and Theology.

While these sessions of the Liberal Arts Deans were going on, The Commission of Colleges and Universities comprising the Presidents of the 28 American colleges and universities held panel discussions on "The Liberal Arts Core Curriculum of the Sixties." The same topic was discussed by the higher education delegates not belonging to either the category of college and university presidents or liberal arts deans in a separate meeting.

The Theologate, Philosophate, and Juniorate sections of the JEA Commission on Houses of Studies held their own meeting during the Easter meeting in discussion of problems peculiar to their curricula.

The Secondary School delegates, as was previously mentioned, were concerned with the developments that had arisen as a result of the August 1964 JEA Santa Clara High School Administrators Institute. Delegates who had been chairmen of general curricula areas at Santa Clara gave follow-up reports of developments in their subject field and opened the topics up for further discussion. The general theme was "The Proper Balance in the Secondary School Curriculum in the Sixties." The key-note address to the secondary school delegates was given by Father John R. Vigneau, S.J., Principal of Xavier High School, Concord, Massachusetts. Follow-up reports were given on Monday in the general areas of Latin, Modern Languages, English, Mathematics, Science, Religion, Social Studies.

The 1965 JEA National Meeting concluded with a dinner meeting at which all delegates from all institutions were present. At this dinner, with Father Edward B. Rooney, S.J., the President of the Jesuit Educational Association presiding, the delegates were greeted by Very Reverend Father John J. McGinty, S.J., Provincial of the New York Province. The delegates heard a tribute to Father Arthur V. Shea, S.J. on the occasion of his forty years' service as Assistant Principal at Fordham Prep. Father Herbert A. Musurillo, S.J., Professor of Classics at Fordham University, addressed the delegates with a paper entitled "The Ideal of the Full Liberal Education Through High School and College."

The Liberal Arts Core Curriculum of the Sixties

EDMOND J. SMYTH, S.J.

The discussion topic for the college and university delegates to the 1965 Jesuit Educational Association meeting is *The Liberal Arts Core Curriculum of the Sixties as Necessary for the Formation of the Ideal Jesuit College Graduate*. This is also the theme of the Workshop of Liberal Arts Deans scheduled for August at the University of San Francisco. Consequently, I have been asked to present a progress report on the Workshop which would also serve as a background paper for tomorrow's discussion.

The proposal for the Workshop was initially made at a meeting of the J.E.A. Commission on Liberal Arts Colleges held at St. Louis University, 15 April 1963. Fr. Leo McLaughlin, Dean of St. Peter's College, suggested that "the changing role of the Liberal Arts College in the United States" should be a major concern of the Commission. Anticipating the factual aspects of the much quoted statement of Jacques Barzun¹ but refusing to accept its funereal consequences, he pointed out that liberal arts colleges were subjected to two external pressures. The better high schools were preparing students more satisfactorily and, through advanced placement² and enrichment programs, were offering college level work. Our students, in greater numbers, were ambitioning the continuance of their education in graduate and/or professional schools. Both of these facts, laudably encouraging, created problems for liberal arts colleges. If the colleges were to meet the challenges of the first of these pressures, we would have to make certain that our entering freshmen were stimulated, not bored, were intellectually stretched, not academically hindered, by their initial collegiate program. Moreover, if our students were to be prepared to meet the competition for fellowships, scholarships and admission to the best graduate schools, we would have to re-think our liberal arts curricula for incipient specialists without betrayal to incipient specialization. Fr. McLaughlin exhorted the Deans, individually and collectively, to

¹ *New York Times*, 12 December 1963, p. 41.

² For the present status of Advanced Placement Programs in Jesuit high schools, cf. Lorenzo K. Reed, S.J., ed. *Proceedings High-School Administrators' Institute 1964*, (New York: Jesuit Educational Association, 1965) pp. 118-134.

face the facts realistically, to engage in constructive re-thinking and imaginative planning to meet the problems. Therefore, he proposed that a Workshop be held wherein Jesuit liberal arts colleges might study the problems, formulate practical proposals and, if necessary, construct Pilot Programs which could serve as imaginative models. Thus, the Jesuit liberal arts colleges could exercise leadership and not merely copy what others were doing or blindly submit to the pressures.

As a result, a preliminary planning committee was appointed. In a series of three meetings³ the preparatory committee proposed:

1. that a Workshop of Deans be held in 1965;
2. that the Workshop aim at discussing and solving practical problems rather than reviewing the objectives of our liberal arts colleges;
3. that the Workshop theme confine itself to the study of the Jesuit liberal arts core curriculum.

The Board of Governors approved these proposals and the Planning Committee⁴ met at the University of Santa Clara in conjunction with the High School Administrators' Institute to hammer out the details of the Workshop.

The results of this planning were given in three reports⁵ sent to the Deans of Liberal Arts last October. These reports gave the historical background of the Workshop; the context within which it will operate; the *modus operandi* that will be followed in its preparation and at the Workshop itself.

Since most of you received copies of those reports, I do not intend to repeat them tonight. Rather, I think that it is more important that the reasoning behind the reports be explained so that the spirit of the Workshop be better understood.

Since it had been decided that the Workshop should aim at discussing and solving practical problems rather than reviewing the objectives of our liberal arts colleges, the Planning Committee reviewed the valuable work of previous Institutes and Workshops and elected to build, in a spirit of continuity, on Denver, Santa Clara, Spokane and Los Angeles, rather than to repeat their deliberations

³ The preliminary planning committee was composed of: Joseph E. Gough, Chairman, George T. Bergen, John A. Fitterer, Leo P. McLaughlin, Joseph S. Pendergast. They met in Washington, D.C., 12 January 1964; 30 March 1964; Atlantic City, 1 April 1964.

⁴ The permanent planning committee is composed of: Edmond J. Smyth, Chairman and Director of the Workshop, George T. Bergen, John A. Fitterer, Joseph E. Gough, Leo P. McLaughlin.

⁵ These Reports were, dated, 14, 21, 23 October 1964.

and accomplishments.⁶ Recognizing that objectives must be established before means can be determined, we accepted as the objective of Jesuit Liberal Arts Colleges the *formation of the Modern Catholic Jesuit College Graduate* as delineated in previous institutes. Moreover, we decided, if continuity was to be achieved, to work within the context of the *General Principles* and *Profile of the Jesuit College Graduate* enunciated by the Los Angeles Workshop.⁷ We believed that although some might not agree with the precise wording, the *General Principles* and the *Profile* had been accepted not only by the members of the Workshop but also by the majority of American Jesuits.

At the risk of repetition but for the sake of emphasis—a fundamental disagreement with the essentials of these statements would destroy the basis of the coming Workshop—I beg your indulgence to quote:

The Jesuit university is set within the Church, of whose mission it is a part. The mission of the Church is to produce the Christian person; the mission of the Jesuit university is to produce the educated Christian person. The university as distinct from other agencies in the Church forms students in Christian wisdom.

In the Jesuit view, education includes the development and perfecting of the total human being. Hence no education is complete unless it includes the intellectual, moral, religious and spiritual formation of the student. Thus, the moral, religious and spiritual formation, which is of particular importance at the collegiate level, is an over-all and essential objective of every Jesuit college. To this formation all the activities and all the personnel of the college must contribute, according to their own natures and functions within the institution.

This cardinal principle of Jesuit educational philosophy is one of the assumptions upon which the discussions of this Workshop rest. The academic disciplines of philosophy and theology, which are the core of Christian wisdom, must foster the intellectual formation of the student and, in harmony with this goal and with the academic nature of these disciplines, contribute to the moral, religious and spiritual growth of the student into personal Christian maturity.

The ideal Jesuit college graduate (man or woman) should have achieved a level of academic maturity consistent with certain intellectual qualities. He must have the ability to analyze, synthesize,

⁶ Selected papers and extracts from previous Institutes and Workshops will be sent to the participants as background reading material.

⁷ R. J. Henle, S.J., ed. *Final Report of the Workshop on the Role of Philosophy and Theology as Academic Disciplines and their Integration with the Moral, Religious and Spiritual Life of the Jesuit College Student*, (New York, Jesuit Educational Association, 1962), pp. 413-415.

and evaluate evidence in pursuit of truth; he must also be able to distinguish various types of evidence associated with different kinds of methodologies in the humanistic and scientific disciplines. He should have a special competence in one of these disciplines in order to give depth to his learning in one area of investigation. When in possession of evidence, he should be able to communicate it effectively. He should also have an understanding of and be able to evaluate his own culture (its literature, art, and philosophy) both in its historical development and its present structure; he should also have some acquaintance with and appreciation of other cultures. Finally, he should have a deep understanding of his Faith that will give him a unified view of life, an awareness of the Church as continuing Christ's redemptive action; and a clear perception of his proper role as a member of the Church.

Moreover, he should be marked in the matter of personal maturity (moral, religious, spiritual development) by the following: He should be decisive in confronting life, courageous and hopeful in exercising initiative, yet loyal to legitimate authority. This will demand a positive-minded patience that is neither passivity nor abandonment of ideals. In response to the Christian vocation revealed in Scripture and Sacrament and specified by the contemporary needs and potential of the Church, he will be personally dedicated to Christ and generously committed to creative involvement and leadership in the intellectual, social, cultural, religious life of his world. He must also have a balanced appraisal of reality, especially of the material and the bodily, a recognition of the power and danger of evil, yet a reverence for the goodness of creation and of human achievement.

As a person he should be open in love to God and men of every race and creed; this will enable him to live sympathetically yet apostolically in a pluralistic world. He should have a developing familiarity in prayer with the three divine Persons. This will lead to liberality of mind, awareness of his Christian dignity, and freedom of spirit. Along with this he should have a balance of intellectual humility and independence whereby he respects the traditions and accomplishments of the past but is open to new ideas and developments.⁸

This is a noble ideal. Few, if any of our graduates, attain it by commencement. Its realization will vary from student to student; its fulfillment, even incomplete, is the work of a lifetime. However, the delegates to the Los Angeles Workshop certainly hoped that they were expressing more than "glittering generalities" about education in "Development Office Prose"⁹ when they approved the *Profile of the Jesuit College Graduate*.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ This is the opinion of one faculty member in one of our Jesuit Universities.

Nevertheless, the noblest ideal must eventually descend to the practical order wherein we seek the means to achieve objectives. The means are multiple. The formation of any graduate is the cooperative responsibility of the *entire institution*: faculty, administration, students and staff. In co-curricular and extra-curricular activities the principal agents are the student personnel administrators working cooperatively with the academic faculties. I am certain that the Workshop on Student Personnel Programs and Services, under the direction of Father Gordon Henderson, which will meet at Regis College, Denver, in July, 1965 will sharpen their role and explore means in their activities which will help us attain our objectives. On the other hand, in the academic areas of our undergraduate institutions a major responsibility for a distinctive Jesuit education rests with the Liberal Arts Colleges. Because of the limitations of time, the Deans' Workshop will concentrate on only one of the essential means in the education and formation of our students, the core curriculum and the major field of concentration within liberal arts and sciences, both hopefully taught by a competent and committed faculty.

The major concern of the Los Angeles Workshop was the role of philosophy and theology as academic disciplines and their integration with the moral, religious and spiritual life of the Jesuit college student. The representatives at the Workshop were selected in view of this concern. Nevertheless, some of the delegates felt "the absence of . . . historians, scientists and humanists. . . ." ¹⁰ Consequently, Los Angeles did not complete the work assigned. That Workshop recognized "that other disciplines (as well as theology and philosophy) must survey their content and approach and evaluate them in terms of their contribution to achieving this ideal graduate."¹¹ Moreover, by deliberate design the Workshop did not address itself to specific curricular models. It testified in its proceedings that there were implications and problems still unresolved. For example, in the section on the *Profile*, the following statements were made:

1. Understanding of our culture implies acquaintance with some of the works (philosophical, artistic, etc.) that have helped constitute this culture or are acknowledged as classical results of that culture. How select these works? How and to what

¹⁰ Henle, *Final Report*, p. 445.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 415.

- extent can we familiarize our students with them? Should this include "classics" in the fine arts, some course work in fine arts?
2. What should be done to give our students some understanding of other cultures, particularly Latin American, Far Eastern and African?¹²

Even in the areas of philosophy and theology the Workshop did not tackle the problem of specific curricula. Although it suggested "Some Basic Themes for the Teaching of Theology in College,"¹³ and envisaged "ideally a curriculum extending through four years of undergraduate study";¹⁴ although it listed "Some Basic Philosophical Commitments" and approved a plurality of "approaches and patterns,"¹⁵ still "there was frequent expression of concern about the number of hours that should be required in Theology and Philosophy. No recommendations were suggested in the Workshop, but there seemed to be a desire to re-examine the quantitative requirements, especially in the light of the available manpower and of well-defined goals and purposes."¹⁶

Against this background, the Planning Committee for the San Francisco Workshop did two analyses. An analysis of the *Profile* showed that there were seven points affecting academic maturity and relating specifically to the curriculum:

1. the ability to analyse, synthesize and evaluate evidence in the pursuit of truth;
2. the ability to distinguish various types of evidence associated with different kinds of methodologies in the humanistic and scientific disciplines;
3. a special competence in one of these disciplines;
4. an ability to communicate this evidence effectively;
5. an understanding of and ability to evaluate the literature, art and philosophy of one's own culture both historically and presently;
6. some acquaintance with and appreciation of other cultures;
7. a deep understanding of one's Faith that will give the student a unified view of life, an awareness of the Church as continuing Christ's redemptive action, and a clear perception of his proper role as a member of the Church.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 418.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 416.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 419.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 439.

A second analysis of the Catalogues of the twenty-eight Jesuit Liberal Arts Colleges showed that the present core curricula—here we equated core curricula with required courses—although varying from institution to institution normally included nine major disciplines or categories of disciplines:

1. Communications (i.e., Effective Writing and Speaking)
2. Language and Linguistics
3. Literature
4. History
5. Social Sciences (Economics, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, etc.)
6. Mathematics
7. Natural Sciences (Biology, Chemistry, Physics, etc.)
8. Philosophy
9. Theology

To these, the Planning Committee added Fine Arts. There were two reasons for this decision. The *Profile* had specifically mentioned “an understanding of and ability to evaluate the . . . art . . . of one’s own culture both historically and presently,” and we knew that the Liberal Arts Deans collectively recognized and deplored the Fine Arts deficiency in most of our institutions.

As a result of these two analyses, we decided that the Deans could best study the changing role of the Liberal Arts Colleges in the United States by attempting to correlate the core curriculum and the major field of concentration with the *Profile*. In this decision, it should be noted that we widen the meaning of the core curriculum. We accepted as a working definition “Those courses, skills and attitudes necessary for the formation of the ideal Jesuit college graduate regardless of major.” We added the concepts of “skills and attitudes” not only because of their importance but also because they can be developed outside of a formal course.

The major field of concentration holds a central place in the education of a student. It is the academic discipline which interests him and which he freely chooses for his own. Its requirements he usually accepts without argument; its offerings he infrequently criticizes. A specific academic discipline likewise holds a central place in the life of a faculty member. It is the area of his proficiency and the concern of his intellectual life. Its centrality in the life of the student he encourages; its curriculum he studies and defends. Realistically, therefore, the *Profile* noted that the student

"should have a special competence in one of these disciplines in order to give depth to his learning in one area of investigation." The centrality and importance of a major can be an element of strength in a liberal arts college. It can equally be a source of irritating discontent, enervating specialization, and academic death.

But, the major does not constitute the total curriculum. Even though the specific disciplines can and do contribute to the attainment of the seven points of the *Profile* in varying degrees, still even the most avid specialist will admit that there is need for "something else" which will give, at least, the appearance of breadth of knowledge.

Traditionally in Jesuit colleges this "something else" has been the required core curriculum.¹⁷ Though expressed in different forms and emphasis, these core curricula have been the means whereby Jesuit institutions have realized or hoped to realize their liberal arts commitments. Presumably Jesuit colleges have thought the courses of the core curriculum important, if not essential, since they are usually required. Yet, it is important to note that these courses are the ones most frequently criticized by students and faculties.

Last year I gave a six page questionnaire to our graduating seniors. This questionnaire was an attempt to obtain in writing a critical student evaluation of the University of San Francisco, its courses and professors. One of the questions asked was: "If I had *one principal correction* to make in the present situation of the University, I would change:" I think that some of the answers received are pertinent to our discussion and can be taken as typical:

The radical elimination of the preponderance of the required courses which in general are quite inferior to the rest of the university's courses. They are generally a nuisance in one's pursuance of an education.

The ineffectiveness of a number of required courses. The net result of these . . . courses . . . is to greatly weaken the whole academic picture to many minds.

The heavy emphasis on philosophy and theology. While these courses are acknowledged as vital and, to some extent, valuable, there does seem to be too much emphasis placed on them, especially in the junior and senior years, when students should be free to concentrate on major, minor, and elective subjects.

Too many compulsory courses . . . such as . . . language that are a waste of time and units except for those going to graduate school.

¹⁷ *Proceedings of the Santa Clara Institute for Jesuit College Deans*, (New York: Jesuit Educational Association, 1956). pp. 60-136.

In four years I had not a single elective unit. This is not as liberal an education as you claim to give.

Quotations like these from students who, incidentally, were satisfied with their total university experience should make us reflect. Have courses, required because they were to liberalize, rather imprisoned our students? Have our selected means failed to produce our intended results?

In the *Study and Discussion Guide* printed for the Higher Education sessions of this meeting, the following questions were asked: "Do students want a liberal education? Do they appreciate it? Do they know what to expect from it? Do they know how to go about achieving it in the most productive way? If not, how can we help them?"¹⁸ I would answer that students do want and appreciate a liberal education provided the education, in fact, is liberal and is taught by those who are its fulfillment. However, I am not certain that they know how to go about achieving it in the most productive way because we, administrators and faculties, are not certain how best we can help them achieve it in the Sixties.

If the major is central and important, if the core courses are accepted means to realize our liberal arts commitments, how have we or how should we construct a program or programs which will lead us to our objective, the formation of the Modern Catholic Jesuit College Graduate?

From Los Angeles we learned a great deal about the role of philosophy and theology in this formation; we also realized that there were problems that needed curricular resolution if these two disciplines were effectively to play this role. In preparation for San Francisco we wanted to hear from the scientists—biological, mathematical, physical, social—the historians, the humanists, and again from the philosophers and theologians. We wanted to tap our combined faculties and ask them what they thought was the place of their disciplines in the light of the *Profile*; what were their contributions to the *Profile*; what presently hindered them from attaining their objectives; what programs would they suggest as their contributions to the core curriculum. Consequently, a series of questions was drawn up and distributed to various departments in our twenty-eight colleges. In this way, we hoped to utilize the talent of our institutions in the preparatory studies and to get faculty members, oriented toward and loyally devoted to their disciplines, to work for the common objective of the core curriculum.

¹⁸ *Special Bulletin*, Jesuit Educational Association, No. 310, March 5, 1965, p. 6.

However, we realized that our work at the Workshop would be worthless unless we honestly faced the facts. We knew that there were narrow specialists on our faculties who disparaged the value of liberal education; we knew that there were entrenched interests that would be satisfied only with the *status quo*. Consequently, the Planning Committee determined that the Workshop would accept as its prevailing investigative attitude that of "challenge," (i.e., no course or sequence of courses has the right of "establishment"). The burden of proof must rest with the department or course to establish its place in a core curriculum of the Sixties as necessary for the formation of the ideal Jesuit college graduate.

During the past six months the Deans, divided into ten "academic discipline" committees, and their faculties have been involved in this study. Preliminary reports have been received from the majority of the colleges. The Chairmen of the ten committees have re-worked the received reports and distributed a second report to their membership for preliminary study. Tomorrow these committees will discuss and refine this report and draft a position paper for the consideration of the August Workshop in San Francisco.

What have been some of the highlights of this preliminary work?

Although the Planning Committee had not anticipated that the *Profile* would be questioned, there were some definite reactions. Some faculty members, for instance, have questioned the validity of the *Profile* because of its heavy emphasis on philosophy and theology. One history department had reservations about the *Profile*. For example, one faculty member wrote: "It would be a disaster to assume some Renaissance consensus as to an *ideal graduate* when we are all awaiting the emergence of a new consensus in the Western World; it would be equally bad to assume dogmatic positions on *specifics to produce* this graduate; flexible experimentation is everywhere more productive today. It would be a brave man who would predict what a college will be, or its program, or its product twenty-five years from now." In another part of that report the following statement was made: "It appears to be the sense of the members of the History Department that the *Profile*, as stated, presents an unrealistic and smug picture of a graduate none of us seems to have encountered. We have splendid graduates but they seem not to be limned correctly by the profile. It was the sense of the Department then to 'transmit' the *Profile* as rather poorly stated . . ." Finally, ". . . the *Profile* . . . seems to me to be a verbal projection with no flesh-and-blood counterpart . . . In my view the

thing most disturbing about the *Profile* is that it is so extensively sketched in immeasurables and imponderables. For it seems to me to be rather basic that a proposed standard and norm should be expressed in terms which are acceptably measurable. The *Profile* seems archetypal to me. And I question whether we should be doing a very good job either in curriculum planning or in day-to-day classroom instruction if we were geared to the production of an archetype described in immeasurables."

A Political Science Department judged that the *Profile* is "incomplete, inadequate, antiquated, and unrealistic." The members of the department added: "In the light of *Pacem in Terris* there has to be explicit articulation of the social and political disciplines within the academic framework of the University. The necessary, essential, contemporary Christian attitudes in the areas of the social and political cannot be left to the co-curricular or extra-curricular activities of the University for their achievement by the student."

It is not my intention to comment in detail on these observations. However, it is important that we recognize that there have been reactions to the *Profile*. Are these opinions widespread? Are the differences accidental due to wording or emphasis which can be changed without affecting the substance of the *Profile*? or are the differences such that there is a division among us on basic objectives? It seems to me that it is absolutely necessary that we know whether the *Profile* is substantially accepted by our universities and colleges. If it is not, the fundamental basis of the Deans' Workshop should be changed to an accepted base or we should cancel the Workshop.

I know that our plans did not call for a direct study of the objectives of the Jesuit Liberal Arts Collegés at the Workshop nor at this meeting, but I hope that by tomorrow night we shall know whether there is or is not substantial acceptance of the *Profile* by our colleges and universities.

Just as we have been challenged on the *Profile*, we have also been cautioned about the prevailing Workshop attitude of "challenge." One dean thought that this principle needed some reconsideration and clarification.

I doubt whether or not this principle would be generally accepted by the deans. It seems to me that possession is nine points of the law. If courses or course sequences are established it seems to me that they should not be eliminated unless it is clearly proved that the change is for the better. I should think that there would

be utter chaos in our educational system if we assumed that all changes are good and that the burden of proof rests with the establishment for the retention of a program that has prevailed for many years. I don't mean to say that we should not have an open mind on these problems, but I do think that we should make it clear where the burden of proof lies.

This is a salutary warning. From a reading of the preliminary reports I am confident that the assembled deans will prudentially challenge not wantonly destroy. As another dean prefaced his report:

To me this is a kind of warm-up exercise preparatory to the San Francisco Workshop. In the vigorous re-appraisal proposed, somehow the can must be opened. Once open, even a quick look may tell us that we own a can of worms. I suspect I have one. But one feels especially secure in such an exploratory effort . . . because of the Workshop principle of "no establishment." For years I have felt that our curriculum lay unchallenged, that we have had too vague an objective, and that we lived with a simple faith that we were achieving something. Now the objective has been clarified and we must be confident that the curriculum is appropriate for fulfilling it.

Having read all of the reports submitted, I became acutely aware of the complexity and magnitude of the task before us in San Francisco. In the *Study and Discussion Guide*,¹⁹ the following statement appears: "The Planning Committee has listed ten areas as essential components of the core. Suppose that each student were to take one 6-credit course in each area—60 credits, or roughly the 50 percent of the undergraduate program. Is that all there is to it? Is that the core? It seems too simple. There must be more to it than that." I can only comment on the last sentence with an emphatic "Amen."

If the construction of a core curriculum was a matter of arithmetic, I could inform you now that one group of responses, unintegrated it is true, suggested or implied a total of 114 credits for an ideal core curriculum. Obviously, this is not the answer even if we accepted President Horn's recommendation for a five-year course of arts and sciences and the elimination of the major field of study.²⁰

The Planning Committee expected that there would be a certain amount of arguing *pro domo sua* by the various disciplines in the preliminary reports. We were not disappointed. We had requested opinions from specialists and they spoke from and for their point

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

²⁰ Francis H. Horn, "Five Years for College?" *N.E.A. Journal*, (November 1964), vol. 53, pp. 40-41.

of view. Some argued for the *status quo*; others were reluctant to admit that their discipline did not contribute substantially to most of the seven points of the *Profile*; few thought of their discipline in relation to other academic areas, and fewer considered their discipline as a cohesive part of the total curriculum. Consequently, as we prepare for San Francisco we must bear in mind what Father Wilfred Mallon wrote in the first issue of the *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*.²¹

. . . curriculum, obviously, is not an end in itself, but a means to an end. In the ideal order, no ingredient should be admitted until it has been subjected to the test to prove its effectiveness toward the end . . .

. . . since curriculum is only a means and not an end, we ought in fairness to get down to the serious business of trying to determine whether or not each element of our present curriculum is effectively contributing to the end . . . If we want the end, then we stand to lose nothing but to gain everything by subjecting every segment of our curriculum in turn to a long and penetrating objective inquiry to find out whether or not it deserves a place in the restricted period in which we have to work.

From reading the preliminary reports it was obvious that the core curriculum could be conceived in multiple ways. A study of the results of three recent curricular re-organizations at Holy Cross, Santa Clara and Seattle showed that three institutions did actually implement their curricula differently. The Planning Committee does not think that these three institutions have exhausted the possibilities. At San Francisco we hope that other designs might be conceived and experimented with.

In 1955 at the Santa Clara Institute,²² Father Laurence Britt suggested that "we might give serious thought to methods of accommodating the curriculum to the students, rather than vice versa." Although examples can be given of such accommodation, in these days of Advanced Placement and Enrichment Programs in our high schools, the Workshop should consider Father Britt's challenge in all its implications.

I would challenge anyone to demonstrate that all entering freshmen in any college need and can best profit from taking the same courses in freshman English, or mathematics or chemistry, etc. If they are obliged to "take" such courses, regardless of previously developed competency, it would appear that the curriculum has

²¹ "Future of the Jesuit College Curriculum," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, (June, 1938), vol. 1, pp. 15-16.

²² "Objectives of the Curriculum," *Proceedings of the Santa Clara Institute*, p. 66.

become an end rather than a means. Differentiation of course work for students of varying ability and achievement would involve administrative problems, but the administrators, like the curriculum, are but means to an end, and expendable.

This challenge will raise questions for any core curriculum tied to rigid course requirements.

It has also been suggested that the Workshop consider the possibility of a curriculum design with the major having the centrality or core position. This suggestion has interesting possibilities since it is oriented to the student's major interest and would be primarily designed by a specialist. In this suggestion, historians, for example, would be asked to do the following:

1. Eliminate the present distinction between lower and upper division courses and consider the four year program as a whole.
2. Work out a complete four year program in history which would give a competency in that discipline.
3. Add to this program those courses in related areas which are considered essential in the education of an historian.
4. Add to this program those tool courses, (i.e., a practical course in reading French and/or German) which are considered important for undergraduate competency and graduate work.
5. When these steps are completed, relate the prepared program to the *Profile of the Ideal Catholic Jesuit College Graduate* and add whatever courses and activities to the program which *you* consider necessary to fulfill the objective.

The result of this analysis and curriculum design by historians could serve as an imaginative model for a Pilot Program. I wonder what the curriculum would look like! Would it differ substantially from the present program of a history major in one of our colleges?

On this questioning note I shall complete this report. Our major work yet remains to be done.

Project Models of Liberal Arts Programs

LEO P. McLAUGHLIN, S.J.

Father Smyth ended his report on a questioning note. You should be able to guess that my entire paper will be little more than a series of questions. In one sense, it will be just one question.

There are obvious disadvantages to such an approach. The greatest danger may lie in the fact that these disadvantages are so very obvious that we may be inclined to overlook them. I have long insisted that *the*, or, at least, *a*, main task of a dean is to knock down the obvious. This is not an easy task and it may well be that the greatest difficulty lies in the fact that there is such a narrow line between the obvious and the stupid. Not even deans take extraordinary joy in looking stupid and from the fear of stupidity comes an almost inevitable flight from the obvious.

I am saying this because it is so obvious that the most important quality needed in the 1965 San Francisco Workshop is courage. Courage is not folly and it is right and just that we be afraid of our own tremendous potential for stupidity. But we must not allow this or any other fear to control our actions. We must have the courage to live with the results of our own actions, even though we can be fairly sure that some of our actions will be stupid.

Father Smyth has told you that the proposal for this workshop was initially made at a meeting of the J.E.A. Commission on the Liberal Arts Colleges held at Saint Louis University in April of 1963. I am repeating that information because it highlights some obvious facts. We are all more or less aware that the American educational scene is constantly changing. If you are able to recall the atmosphere of that meeting just two years ago, you will be able to appreciate how radical the changes are. Just two years ago, there were prophets proclaiming that the liberal arts college was already dead. In the face of the overwhelming number of students, it was felt that there wasn't any possibility nor, for that matter, any real need of faculty-student contact. The "multiversity" was becoming a theory as well as a fact and the flight from teaching was not considered a cause for worry. When people bothered to think about non-teaching teachers, this, too, was considered to be rather unimportant.

I am sure that all of us are aware that there is an agonizing

reappraisal going on at the present time. However, in the midst of all this change, some things haven't changed. Two years ago, each and every Jesuit college exercised some influence in its own area. Two years ago, there were very few examples of cooperative effort on the part of Jesuit colleges. Jesuits from different colleges talked to each other at annual meetings but Jesuit colleges did not act together in such a way that Jesuit colleges as a group made a major impact upon American education. Two years ago, many Jesuits as individuals were whispering that the student really is important. It's too bad that those Jesuits didn't get together and shout a fact which we all knew; we would have been two years ahead of our time. Now, and I'm afraid it is "once again," all we can do, as a group, is to say: "me, too."

I have mentioned all this because it is important to prepare our attitudes as we make final plans for the Deans' Workshop of 1965.

The role of Jesuit education, and I am thinking of Jesuit education as somehow in contradistinction to the role of the individual Jesuit college, lies in the balance. We are approaching what could be, what may well be, our "moment of truth." Time alone will tell if we have the necessary courage and wisdom to act together in 1965.

Even now, before we enter a final phase of preparation, it is important to understand that our "moment of truth" will not be found in the moment of inspiration. Our "moment of truth" will be real, or unreal, insofar as we accept, or fail to accept, the drudgery and, yes, the torture of working out the endless details of cooperative action.

Now, at long last, I come to my assigned topic: A Report on Project Models of Liberal Arts Programs. I like the title, for, in very truth, I am going to talk about examples of possible experiments. One model which I wish to propose is based upon something which I think is fairly obvious: many graduates of American colleges are effectively illiterate. By that unpleasant statement, I wish in this context to mean that many college graduates cannot write decent English. I think that all of us will agree that this statement is connected with the Profile of the Ideal Jesuit Graduate. Thus, this statement opens up a fairly large number of possible projects. There is the study of the fact and it would be surely fitting for a group of our colleges to undertake a project designed to discover whether or not this statement is true. A second stage could be built into this project: if a study shows that there is a problem,

this second stage would attempt to discover the extent of the problem and to enter into the very delicate area of the causes of this problem.

While I would be very happy to see the results of such a project, I am sorry to say that I already have enough evidence, scientific or not, to satisfy my feeble mind. I have seen concrete evidence of effective illiteracy. I have listened to the anguished cries of professors bemoaning the fact that no one has ever taught their students to write decent English. I have sat in numbed silence as business executives have complained over and over again that college graduates cannot write.

Against this unhappy background, I would like to suggest a project model which would try to find more than a temporary solution to this problem. To be more than temporary, this project would have to operate on different levels. On one very delicate level, this project would try to discover the causes or conditions which have brought about this state of affairs. I have already mentioned the present concern about the flight from teaching. We should carefully study the possibility that the flight from teaching can take various forms and that one form could have been a flight from the drudgery of correcting compositions.

A study along this line implies some fault on the part of the teachers. Thus there should be phases of this project which would attempt to find ways of making this drudgery bearable. We should search to find ways of rewarding those teachers who accept this drudgery. As soon as you begin to think about this problem, you will see the need for a devastating project: this illiteracy may not have come into existence suddenly and full grown. Would we have the courage to investigate whether or not young candidates for teaching positions, fully qualified professionally, have a real knowledge of or feeling for English? Is there a need to teach these future college teachers to write?

It seems fairly safe to say that Jesuit liberal arts colleges have not been wildly enthusiastic about "methods" courses. In the face of this attitude, would we be willing to experiment with ways and means of teaching these future college teachers to teach writing?

Last summer, when the planning committee talked of this problem, I was thinking of another project. Almost against my will, I have been pushed by the nature of the problem into suggesting projects connected with the teacher. But my initial idea was that in many courses, particularly courses in the humanities and social sci-

ences, there is a very definite and intimate connection between knowledge and the expression of that knowledge. I thought then and I still believe that it would be worth while to attempt an experiment which would indicate whether or not courses can be offered which place equal emphasis upon content and expression.

Thus I wish to propose that at San Francisco, some of the deans attempt to prepare the details of a project which would indicate whether or not such a double approach has value and validity. This may sound fairly easy. Before we begin, I can tell you that I have been wrestling with the details of this project for the last year and I speak from deep pain when I say that this project will be difficult to plan and even more difficult to execute.

There are other possible projects connected with this same problem of illiteracy at a high level. Some years ago, I tried to involve the entire faculty of Saint Peter's College in what I called "Operation Decent English." Once again, the idea was very simple: all members of the faculty were asked to stress the importance of correct writing and to fail or to penalize all papers which were notably deficient in such high level skills as spelling, punctuation and grammar. The experiment failed magnificently. However, with more care, with better planning and more careful execution, a similar project may succeed. At San Francisco, some of the deans may wish to plan such a project.

Last September, I started to wrestle with what I thought would be one project. It didn't take me long to discover that one project leads to more projects. Thus, I found myself involved with projects for teachers. I became convinced that any project which is looking for a long term solution must search for effective ways and means of involving faculty. But it is also true that you cannot talk of a project without looking for tests which will indicate the value and validity of a particular experiment. I hope that at San Francisco the deans will understand this need to find tests which will indicate the validity of the experiments. This is important in itself and also as an attitude: the idea of this workshop is not to jump wildly into change for the sake of change. One main goal, perhaps *the* main goal, is to start cooperative action so that we may evaluate the traditional, so that we may see what changes, if any, are needed to help us to fulfill our profile of the ideal graduate.

When I originally planned this talk, I intended to speak merely of this one problem of illiteracy and to suggest some possible projects. If this problem exists, it is not a problem merely for Jesuit

institutions. The problem is not one which Jesuit institutions have a special obligation to face.

I would like to end this talk by speaking briefly about a problem which is more closely connected with our institutions as Jesuit and as Catholic. Once again, we were ahead of our time in thinking and talking about this matter and anyone who will read the reports from the 1962 Workshop in Los Angeles will find material in abundance for cooperative action. I shall speak of only one area: the whole concept of ecumenical involvement is now current throughout Christendom. The spirit of Ecumenism has surely touched our campuses in different ways. But it is possible that we have thought of our colleges as somehow on the fringe of the whole movement. I hope that the deans in San Francisco will be willing to consider the possibility that the Ecumenical movement has real need of our colleges.

I have been told that there are opportunities on all sides for a significant Ecumenical involvement for our colleges. The situation is changing almost from day to day. In the immediate future, more and more opportunities for significant Ecumenical involvement will be opening up in many parts of the country. In a relatively short time, the opportunities for leadership will have passed. I respectfully suggest that we should act together in a matter which touches us so essentially. The opportunities are here *now*. I can understand the man who carefully considers the opportunities and decides not to act. I have the deepest sympathy for the men who, after the same careful consideration, decide to act together. But this is not the time to shut our eyes to the opportunity. This is not the time to deny the existence of the opportunity. This is not the time to talk about the opportunity and to refuse to decide.

This evening, I wish merely to indicate the broad basis of the opportunities and of the areas in which decisions should be made. The present opportunity for Ecumenical involvement has many dimensions but two essential directions should be clearly understood: In one direction, there is the contribution which we, as Jesuit institutions, can make to the whole area of religion and education in this country. A magnificent start has been made at Los Angeles. In the other direction, there must be a willingness to study the possibility that we can receive valuable insights from others. And it may well be that we shall have more difficulty in receiving than in giving.

I am going to end on this note because, in a strange sort of way,

it expresses my hope for the Deans' Workshop. Whether we like it or not, in an age of such rapid change, we, too, are going to change. By an openness of spirit, by a wise use of carefully planned experiments, by the wisdom to see the opportunities and the needs which now exist and by the courage to accept the disadvantages as well as the advantages of these opportunities, we shall be able to play a role in determining our own future. If we act together, we may play a part in determining the future of American education.

Jesuit Secondary School Curriculum

JOHN R. VIGNEAU, S.J.

It was Gilbert Highet who attributed the success of Jesuit education to planning, adaptability, and the selection of the curriculum. Even a cursory perusal of the *Proceedings* of the Administrators' Institute held at Santa Clara last August should impress the reader with the awareness that the modern Jesuit educator is still very dedicated to these identical principles. At this Institute a notable attempt was made to re-discover the devious pathways leading to academic excellence and to re-establish the Society of Jesus among the leaders in secondary school education. However, it is not our purpose to indulge in self-satisfied compliments; but rather to confront realistically some of the more practical issues involved in implementing this quest for excellence.

The publication of the *Proceedings* has allowed each of us to review the detailed recommendations of the various committees. Father Lorenzo K. Reed has carefully extracted the most important proposals suggested by the committee reports and published these propositions in the form of a Discussion Guide. In typical Reedian style we have all received lists of patterns of courses. These detailed tabulations of maximum and minimum programs and his summaries and suggestions are to serve as the topics of our discussions tomorrow. For me to repeat the work of the committees would be an impertinence; to review the summary of Father Reed's patterns and suggestions would be to intrude into the area of tomorrow's discussions and resolutions.

The study and analysis of the academic disciplines by the committee were painstaking and thorough. Of necessity, the review was limited to each branch of knowledge in succession. At no time did we have the opportunity to study the curriculum as a whole, as an inter-relating pattern of ideas. At no time did we face the inevitable conflicts of time, teachers, finances, and physical resources that have dulled the glow of enthusiasm which we all experienced under the warmth of the California sun. It may not be by chance that we have had to return to the impersonal existence of the great eastern metropolis to face the cold realities of the educational world.

Before we meet the practical problems and before we select the "ideal curriculum" it seems that we must look at some of the broad-

er issues. Otherwise, narrowly conceived decisions will plant the germ of destruction in the fruit of our apostolic work at a critical moment in Christian history. Unless our vision focuses on the past, present, and future our work will be sterile and will be relegated to that endless list of reports hopefully but ineffectively submitted to the Jesuit Educational Association. In the belief that our work will endure and that it will be pointed to with pride by many educators I propose this evening to submit some reflections on three areas: 1) humanism in our curriculum, 2) curriculum as a creative continuum, and 3) the principle of adaptation. In each of these three categories I shall raise some questions of administrative attitudes and procedures that may be questioned in the light of recent developments.

Humanism in Jesuit Secondary School Education:

In the not too distant past the Society's high school curriculum was almost exclusively committed to the instruction of the classical languages. English, mathematics, modern languages, and history were of secondary importance. Alas, science was admitted to the course of studies almost as a token gesture to fallen human nature! Without deprecating in any way the education of this era, it still must be pointed out that this priority given to the classical languages fostered the misunderstanding that the classics and the humanities were identical. Even the International Conference of the Apostolate of Secondary Schools meeting in Rome in 1963 felt it necessary to point out that humanities were not to be identified with any one subject. This International Conference stated this important principle in these words:

"The concept of humanism is not itself identified with any specific category of subjects as such. It implies a connection with permanent human values even if the forms that these values assumed differed, for example, in the sixteenth, eighteenth, or twentieth centuries."¹

Granting that the classical studies should more easily lead to a truly liberal education yet it must be accepted that this potential is shared at least to a lesser degree by other fields of academic endeavor. The humanistic vision of the mind can be absent from classical studies just as it may be present in chemistry or mathematics. Nothing has been less liberal and humanistic than the grammatical, "fifty line a night" translation approach to the classical

¹ "International Conference on the Apostolate of Secondary Schools," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Vol. XXVII, No. 1, June 1964, pp. 57-8.

studies. If the classical studies wish to regain their pre-eminence as the best tutors to a genuine humanism they must now win this right in competition with the other disciplines.

The importance of an authentic humanism in the secondary schools is highlighted by the undeniable trend towards early specialization in the undergraduate college education. The liberal arts college is threatening to become a pre-professional school and is frankly concerned about the consequent neglect of the liberal education. This development may be arrested or diverted but it seems more likely to grow with the possible disappearance of the liberal arts college as we know it today. This eventuality is an added incentive for us to take steps to guarantee that our secondary schools be genuinely humanistic.

It is not sufficient for us to write in our school catalogs that "the Jesuit Education based on the *Ratio Studiorum* is humanistic." What is humanistic about many of our biology courses? Have we fully appreciated the approach towards mathematics as a language? (It is noteworthy that the International Conference meeting in Rome 1963 spoke of mathematics as a language and urged that we "humanize" the physical sciences.²) On the other hand are we influenced by an ultra liberalism that shrinks from teaching values? If our schools are truly humanistic in the Christian sense can we adequately explain the smug concern with security of too many of our students and the consequent drop-off of religious vocations?

One suspects that as we pen the words "Christian humanism" we raise more questions than we are willing or able to answer! Over the years we have developed a confused idea of what our humanistic tradition really is. The works of men like Father Ganss have broadened our vision, but we still have not formulated with any conviction or precision the nature of our Jesuit humanism. We have studied and evaluated with interest and discernment the studies and projects of many curriculum planning groups but we have as yet failed to analyze with complete satisfaction what is the unique spirit and contribution of Jesuit educators. It may well be that Jesuit humanism is beyond definition and is intimately caught up in the experience of the Spiritual Exercises but it well behooves us at this point in our planning not to compound the error by believing humanism will be taught by five hours of English and five hours of history and five hours of Latin. The selection of the best course, the proper balance of various components, the recognition

² *Ibid.*, p. 59.

of individual talents is but a preliminary step. After all of this is accomplished—you and I with our faculties must begin the more important work of re-discovering and reinstating the magnificent heritage that is ours as Jesuit humanists.

The Curriculum as a Creative Continuum

When we arrived at Santa Clara some of us naively thought that we would learn the most recent developments in curriculum planning and that we could rest assured that at least in this particular area of our administrative duties we would be abreast of the field for several years. It is my conviction that at the adjournment of our last session we were already two years behind the latest movements.

It is no exaggeration to state that during the eight months that have slipped by since our meeting we have already witnessed new developments in important areas of curriculum study. The Harvard Project Physics supported by the United States Office of Education, The Carnegie Corporation, and the Sloan Foundation and under the direction of Harvard University will serve as an example of the rapidity of change.

After several years of quiet study and research this Harvard Project Physics has developed a pilot program that is less than a year old. Like similar projects under the sponsorship of Educational Services Incorporated which directs the PSSC Physics, the new Introductory Physical Science Course, and the Social Studies Curriculum Program, the research, writing, and experiments have been done by scientists and high school teachers. Within the next three years they expect to develop for general use this new approach which will have a wider appeal than the PSSC physics course and still be more laboratory and "discovery" oriented than the traditional course.

If you consider this an isolated case you will do well to ponder what J. Stanley Marshall wrote in 1963 for the American Association for the Advancement of Science about the new science courses:

"The leaders of the present projects generally agree that their materials will doubtlessly be obsolete within ten years. It is therefore imperative that you and your students regard new courses, valuable as they are, as one phase of curriculum through which the program is presently passing."³

³ J. Stanley Marshall, "The Improvement of Science Education and the Administrator," *The New School Science*, (A Report to School Administrators on Regional Orientation Conferences in Science), American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1963, p. 12.

The spokesmen for these curriculum studies consider the curriculum as a continuum. The notion of an "ideal curriculum" is foreign to their mode of thought. There is nothing static or permanent about the course of studies. It must always be re-evaluated and changed, expanded, dropped, or replaced as new needs, social factors, or discoveries are made. Their thought seems to be that improvements of education must be a continuing process with built-in processes of evaluation and research.

The most recent and authoritative report on the modern mathematics expresses the same thought: "The passage of time will, we hope, make this tentative statement of goals (of the Cambridge Conference on School Mathematics) obsolete."⁴

The day before I departed for this convention it was called to my attention that in a long review of the Cambridge Report, Marshall H. Stone of the University of Chicago accepts the challenge offered by this report but states that he is "in no doubt whatsoever that the Report by implication rejects many of the bolder, more imaginative, and profound modifications of the school mathematics curriculum that are beginning to win acceptance in Europe."⁵ Remember that the Cambridge Report wants "to compress the mathematical program so that what is now taught over twelve years of school plus three of college can be completed by the end of high school."⁶ This optimum curriculum for 1990 for the Cambridge Conference would hardly suffice for 1965 in the opinion of Dr. Stone. In the field of mathematics, then, we could more accurately refer to the curriculum as "exploding" rather than "changing."

Jesuit administrators spend long years searching for the ideal curriculum and yet these educators presume that each curriculum is a continuum. Are we seeking the eternal verities in the wrong place? Jesuit administrators subconsciously long for the neat, easily categorized curriculum of yesterday yet these educational leaders express the hope that their efforts will soon be obsolete. Is it possible that we are afraid of change, afraid of what it might do to our administrative policies and procedures? Jesuit administrators want to freeze a curriculum and instead it becomes static, devoid of all creative spark.

All administrators instinctively desire to codify and make perma-

⁴ Goals for School Mathematics, (The Report of the Cambridge Conference on School Mathematics), Educational Services, Inc., Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston 1963, p. 67.

⁵ Marshall H. Stone, *The Mathematics Teacher*, (review of "Goals for School Mathematics"), Vol. LVIII, No. 4; April 1965, p. 353.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 354.

ment, knowing from experience that change involves pain for someone. We do not desire change for change sake; we must not experiment at the expense of our students; and yet to remain static, to give into the temptation to codify, is to commit Jesuit high schools to a second rate education and to abdicate the right of leadership in American education.

If we wonder if this continuum will persist the words of an author in a recent issue of the *College Board Review* should make us reconsider:

"Let me state this explicitly: I would prophesy that, possibly within ten years, a properly educated graduate of a secondary school of true quality will be expected to have a real command of a foreign language as well as his own, a knowledge of mathematics through calculus, a familiarity with both physical and biological sciences, an extensive exposure to history and social science, a trained sensitivity to the arts. The levels of achievement I am suggesting add up to at least one year of work beyond that presently included in secondary education through the twelfth grade."⁷

Prophecies are easily proclaimed and seldom verified. But the trends observable make us wonder if the author may only have erred by understatement.

No modern educational document speaks of evolution in such sweeping terms as we find in the International Conference of the Apostolate of Secondary Schools. The quantity and quality of students, the concept of humanism, esthetic values of the fine arts, and the curriculum are all spoken of in terms of "evolution," "tremendous change," and "process of evolution."⁸ This distinguished group of Jesuit educators recognized the signs of the times and understood the implications of what this evolution must mean to our educational system.

Whatever the future will bring it seems clear that the curriculum changes and educational evolution are factors to be reckoned with by administrators without any fear of compromising the educational work of the Church. But it is equally evident that this is not the work of administrators alone. In an entirely new way we must turn with confidence to our teachers. We have already seen that the most influential and most solid contributions to the curriculum have been made by selected high school teachers working in close cooperation with renowned scholars of the universities. It is only by way of exception that we discover the name of an administrator

⁷ Thomas C. Mendenhall, *College Board Review*, Winter 1964, No. 52, p. 32.

⁸ Op. Cit., *passim*.

on any one of these committees. Consequently, we may profitably consider the principal's position and teacher's role in curriculum study.

Years ago the Jesuit principal was often appointed because he was the master teacher. Frequently he could teach every subject offered in the school and at all levels. Regretfully the age of giants has passed and now a principal is indeed fortunate if he is competent in one specialty. The frontiers of knowledge have been pushed back so rapidly on all fronts that it is expecting the impossible for any principal to be competent in each subject. Clearly he must follow the general trends and evaluate programs, but the teacher must become the specialist on whom we depend.

Thoughtful consideration to the importance of the mature teacher must be given as we weigh the advantage of curriculum change. The administrator-oriented program may be accepted with obedience and even generosity, but the program that will engender real enthusiasm must come from the teacher. Once we accept these new programs we commit ourselves to an evolving curriculum whose growth depends on our dedicated teachers. We must guard against the proliferation of experiments and establish the legitimate boundaries for each curriculum but we must also allow more flexibility and initiative for our teachers. Changes that will continue to grow and evolve require a process of curriculum planning that becomes the concern of those professionally trained to do the evaluating and study—our own dedicated Jesuit teachers and lay associates. As administrators we do not, indeed cannot, abdicate our authority but we can no longer be the sole instigator, evaluator, and judge of curriculum. We can inspire, we should lead but we must depend on our teachers in an entirely new way if our experimental programs are to succeed and grow.

It is worthy of note that while we have had administration controlled curriculum planning we have had very few Jesuits working as advisors or writers on these national projects. It is likewise important to observe that the few we have had have been teachers. One suspects that we shall never gain positions of influence in these groups until we have trained and encouraged more and more of our teachers to study the developments, be willing to expend of their time and energy in feed-back reports for pilot programs, and finally to gain positions of influence and trust. We have already accepted these programs developed by others—why not make it possible for the Church to have witnesses in these powerful commit-

tees by returning some of the initiative to our teachers?

Furthermore, in the light of the curriculum as a creative continuum we may well wonder about the practicality of detailed syllabi, uniformity in textbooks, and Province examinations. Doubtless the uniformity has value but it may not seem quite as desirable when we dare to venture into the educational world of the ever-changing curriculum. Conformity to detailed regulations may make it easier to control and administer but it also can dampen the trained, mature initiative of experienced teachers. We can canonize efficiency, and we can hide timidity behind regulations. In the final analysis the enthusiastic, dedicated teacher is more important than our neatly packaged systems. Our new curriculum planning forces each administration honestly to answer the query: is administration for the good of teaching, or teaching for the benefit of administration?

In summary then, we have considered that all experts including those Jesuits gathered at Rome in September 1963 consider that the curriculum is no longer fixed but a continuum. This demands that we change our modes of thought about curriculum, that we evaluate the leadership of our administration, and that we recognize the new dignity of the professional teacher.

Principle of Adaptability

When Ignatius founded the Society of Jesus he used all of his administrative genius to create a Company that would perpetuate not Ignatius but Jesus Christ. This Company, unlike other Orders with their vows of stability and precisely defined apostolic works, was to be free to do whatever the Church asked of it. A delicate system of adaptability which is sensitive to the ever changing needs in Christ's vineyard made this apostolic freedom possible. This spirit of flexibility was paramount in Ignatius' concept of the Society and of its educational apostolate. The heroic efforts of adaptation by our early missionaries in China and India are tragic testimonials to Jesuit adaptability.

As a principle of educational administration adaptability has always been extolled by theorists and practicing teachers in the Society. The very last paragraphs of Father Reed's concluding remarks at the Fifth Institute are a statement on the position of importance in our educational practice of flexibility and adaptability. It is so basic we almost take it for granted.

I have attempted to justify in some detail the significance of this

principle because I suspect we may have misused it in our present educational philosophy. The insights of all geniuses (including Saints) are stimulating and challenging, but they run the risk of becoming dull and lifeless once they are codified into the laws of an organization. To counteract this human weakness Ignatius demanded that each Jesuit make the complete *Spiritual Exercises* twice during his life as a Jesuit. One of the reasons for this experiment was the desire that Ignatius had that each of us share his vision and make the Institute which he formulated a deeply personal commitment. The principle of flexibility then should be something dynamic and challenging to us.

One wonders if we have not misused in our education this creative idea of Ignatius. Adaptability to the early Society was a positive attitude of mind and soul. It was courageous, a careful weighing of goals and methods and then a daring willingness to experiment. Is it not possible that in our weak hands this has become a tool of conservatism, a reluctance to lead, a timidity founded on a sense of inferiority? This I know: the principle of adaptation has been used by me too often in a cowardly fashion and I suspect that Ignatius never meant that at all.

The standard practice seems to be to meet new developments with some hostility, then a period of vigorous rebuttal followed by aloof silence. Quietly we eventually accept and possibly misuse. Only later do we get around to a theoretical and philosophic justification of our acceptance of what has been previously condemned. Psychological testing is an outstanding example of this phenomenon. And all this in the name of adaptation!

Examine closely the changes we accepted last summer. Numberless proposals were made and projects were evaluated, and we did not even consider the social sciences, art, and music. But with the sole exception of the Novak Religion Text these were all programs conceived and written by others. As one of the largest groups of independent schools we had made but a ripple in educational thought. We came docilely to Santa Clara to learn and learn we did—at the feet of other masters. We cannot wait another decade to assemble together and to evaluate new developments if we intend to become leaders in the educational work. Of course we must evaluate, certainly we must select, but with teachers encouraged to join and work on these nationally sponsored groups we can move ahead with courage, daring to experiment, and confident that we have a unique contribution to make to education. To con-

tinue to use the principle of adaptation as a credit card for bargain hunting in secondhand courses of study is to court perpetual mediocrity. Some of our schools have dared to break out of this pattern and they are the schools that have won the laurels that the rest of us are enjoying. But the real mark of Jesuit Secondary Schools will only be made when working fifty strong, cooperating with each other in a spirit of unity and despising petty jealousies, we dare to be great. There is no other system of schools like it in the country; it would not take too much courageous and concerted effort on our part to become the leading college preparatory system in the country by the end of the next decade.

PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS:

Do I have any practical recommendations to offer towards a solution of the problems pointed up by Father Reed's "discussion guide"?

First, there is the possibility that our weak social studies curriculum can be strengthened by teachers in other disciplines. Areas of ancient history can easily be taught by Latin and Greek teachers without straining the texts, already a considerable amount of Old Testament and Church History is taught in the Novak Text, the relationship between English and American History and literature is evident, and the influence of science and technology on the history of mankind can be highlighted in science courses without much effort. The amount of new historical lore learned from such an approach may be negligible but the creating of a true sense of history might well be better developed through the various disciplines. An awareness by all teachers of this deficiency in our courses of study could help to give some of their classes a different perspective and could substantially assist in an important area of our humanistic training.

A second recommendation might make it possible for us to add more courses. I suggest that some of the homework done by our students is of the nature of "busy work" and that the time wasted in repetitive written assignments could be more profitably used by students in other courses. This is not to suggest that our students should do less work, but rather that they might study more spontaneously and effectively and be more productive and creative if their homework assignments were truly an intimate part of the learning process and not just a routine gesture of magisterial authority.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, then, I suggest that as we hammer out the details of our curriculum sequences in tomorrow's discussions and as we attempt to implement them in our schools we bear in mind: first, we are committed to a humanistic education and to rediscovering all the ramifications in that great tradition, second, the curriculum can no longer remain static . . . there will never be another "ideal curriculum" . . . and that this condition puts a new demand on our loyal teachers, and may change our administrative patterns, and, third, that we may well prayerfully reconsider the true meaning of the principle of adaptation in our schools.

Finally, because of the great Jesuit administrators and teachers, past and present, we are now in a position to move into leadership as secondary school educators. The times, needs and developments may demand differences of approach and methods; but the fact that we are now in such an admirable position is a magnificent testimonial to their dedicated service and to the wisdom of their vision and patient experience. But for us gathered here this evening, opposed as we are by many about the true value of Catholic education and beset by other unresolved conflicts and difficulties it may be the great opportunity for us to move courageously forward, to re-establish the Society's schools in the vanguard, and to meet the challenges offered us by the Vatican Council under the guidance of the Spirit of Truth.

Monday Morning Session (April 19) of JEA High School Delegates

JOSEPH T. BROWNE, S.J.

Father Browne indicated in his introduction that, in a certain sense, the purpose of the morning's session was to face reality. At Santa Clara, last summer, each subject area was covered and certain recommendations were made. The task facing the delegates this morning was to put together the recommendations of the several curriculum Committees, so as to form a comprehensive, well-balanced curriculum.

Father Browne called attention to two documents: first, Father Vigneau's key note address in which he outlined the broader issues: namely, "Humanism," the curriculum as a creative continuum and adaptation. Secondly, he called attention to the *Minutes* of the International Conference on the Apostolate of Secondary Schools¹ where it was pointed out that Humanism is not to be equated with any particular subject, but rather it is concerned with permanent human values. This document indicates that we are talking about humanistic components and points out three of them: the religious component, the humane sciences (i.e., man and what is human) and the material universe (i.e., the physical world). The International Congress continued on to point out that there will be, of course, overlapping in the curriculum. It showed that the formal component is very important in humanistic education. By that it meant the way in which subjects are taught. However, Father Browne stated that for our discussion today we will presume that the formal element is present, i.e., that we have humanistic teachers.

Latin and Modern Languages. The first Chairman reporting was Father Vigneau, Principal of Xavier High School, Concord, Massachusetts, who pointed out that the Latin Committee did not endorse any particular approach in teaching Latin, but insisted that whatever system is chosen must be consistent and, where necessary, must have teachers trained in its method. The Committee recommended an early exposure to Literature. It also went on record against a two-year Latin program. Its one final suggestion was that perhaps the Freshmen should begin with Modern Language and that some Sophomores, who showed ability and interest in Lan-

¹ Jesuit Educational Quarterly, Vol. XXVII, No. 1, June 1964, pp. 57-8.

guages, be admitted to a Latin course of three years. These, of course, would be the better students. Father went on to point out some possible benefits, namely, that only good students would be in the Latin classes and that there would be high motivation. This arrangement would also recognize the importance of Modern Language studies. The main difficulty with this idea would be the psychological effect on the Latin teachers who might feel that their prestige was being lowered; and secondly, it might be hard to hire enough good Modern Language teachers to handle the four-year Modern Language program.

In the discussion which followed the first question concerned the mind-training element in Latin. Father Vigneau felt that in the past this value was concentrated on the grammar. He felt that such training would be better founded on Literature and humanistic values. Some participants suggested that we teach both Modern Language and Latin in Freshman year. Father Vigneau felt that the curriculum in Freshman year was already crowded and that two Languages would be too difficult to handle.

The question was raised concerning any experience of students entering our schools who have already had Modern Language in grammar school. It was felt that, despite their grammar school training, they did not know a great deal in this area. It was felt that the real question might be phrased thus: "Is Latin or Modern Language better for the humanistic training of our students?" Father Vigneau claimed that his Committee was hoping for both Modern Language and Latin for most students, but that the practical problem mentioned earlier still remained. It was mentioned that at the recent Northeast Conference of Modern Language Teachers it was recommended that if only one foreign Language were taught, the choice of that Language be made on a basis of the competence of the teachers available.

Father Browne reminded all that it was presumed that Language study is essential for humanistic education. Our present problem seemed to be whether Modern Language or Latin, in a four-year sequence, was the better tool. It was pointed out that we should look to our colleges for some guidance in this matter. Many felt that the colleges had no specific requirements in Language studies. Father Mackin was asked to inform the group, from his experience in Admissions at Boston College, concerning the Language preferences of our colleges. He replied that our colleges pay attention to high school Latin and Greek only if a student is thinking

of majoring in Classics in college. Otherwise, he said, they more or less prescind from Latin and Greek achievement scores.

Father Munteer, Principal of Canisius High School, reported that he had taken a survey of the Language requirements of most of the colleges in the East. It seemed that most of these colleges would accept any Language, apparently including Latin.

Father Munteer also pointed out that there are really two types of Latin teachers: those who stress the literary values of Latin, and those who stress grammatical aspects—the Language-science aspects of Latin. Father felt that Father Vigneau's Committee was not too enthusiastic about the latter type. Father Munteer suggested certain questions concerning a two-year Latin program, especially if it were taught with the stress on Language as a science.

First Question: "If English Grammar is taught in the elementary school and taught poorly, can a boy be expected to learn it in high school?"

Second Question: "If Grammar is taught in the elementary school, can Latin, taught as a science, add anything to this?"

Third Question: "Can a structure of Language be better learned in a Modern Language or in Latin?"

Fourth Question: "Can a study of Latin be vocationally and culturally advantageous to a student?"

Fifth Question: "Is Modern Language easier to learn than Latin?"

Sixth Question: "Is the study of Science and Mathematics enough for the rigorous discipline of the mind, or must there be a type of discipline learned in the Language area?" In other words, "does the rigor of thought that comes from Mathematics transfer to a Language area?"

Some of the delegates felt that in posing a choice between Latin and Modern Language we might, like our colleges, be stressing expediency. Others warned against an excessive concern for what the colleges think and want.

Many delegates felt that Latin and Modern Language should not be demanded from all of our students, mostly because of the pressure from other curricular areas. A sequential four-year program of study either in Modern Language or in Latin would seem to fill the bill. The point was raised again that at the Northeast Conference of Language Teachers, one expert indicated that one Language well taught is better than two Languages poorly taught. Also, at the same Conference, it was stated that a minimum of four years in a Language is absolutely necessary and that, if there must be a choice made between Modern Language and Latin, this choice should be made according to the good teachers available. If all the teach-

ers were equal, it was stated, at this same Conference, that Modern Language should be preferred. In answer to the objection that four-years' study of Modern Language would give complete mastery, Father Munteer pointed out that the Modern Language Association advocated a six-year program. It was presumed that students with a four-year program in high school would complete this with two more years in college.

Father Maline said that it seemed to him that our high school graduates are neither proud of their four years of Latin study nor of their two years of Modern Language study, i.e., they do not have a sense of accomplishment in either one. It seemed to him, therefore, that a four-year program in Modern Language might lead to a sense of competence and accomplishment in our graduates.

In answer to a suggestion that Modern Language be taught for four years, two or three times a week, Father Browne pointed out that according to the recommendations of the Modern Language Association it was necessary to have five solid periods of Modern Language each week. The stress on hearing and speaking in the early stages of Language learning today demands this much time if the student is to master the subject.

One of the delegates felt that the reason for the decline in Latin study in our schools is that our Scholastics are not convinced of its value. Father Duminuco, Woodstock College, said that he felt he could speak for the other young men at Woodstock. He finds that they will not identify Humanism with Latin. Secondly, they were never given reasons for the emphasis on Latin. Third, there is a general tendency away from high school teaching and he suspects that part of it is because the Scholastics have seen so many of our high school students and teachers discouraged by Latin.

The objection was raised that in this discussion we have been neglecting the other five or six subjects in our curriculum, even in the context of humanistic education. It was felt that we had discussed Latin and Modern Language more than sufficiently and that we should move on to another subject field.

Father Vigneau ended the morning discussion by stating that, when the Latin Committee presented its proposals at Santa Clara, no such comments were made by the delegates as were made this morning. He wanted to go on record as saying that his Committee did not intend to have Latin dropped from the curriculum, but rather to stimulate an interest in it and to achieve better results from our students.

Monday Afternoon Session (April 19) of JEA High School Delegates

CORNELIUS J. CARR, S.J.

English. Father Joseph Ayd, principal of St. Joseph's Prep in Philadelphia, introduced his subject by stating that at Santa Clara all were in agreement that four years of English should be mandatory in all of our schools, and that the general objectives of the course should be to read and write well. The problem is how to obtain these objectives. Both the Buffalo and Maryland provinces are working towards a solution by developing new English materials. It was agreed in discussion that the English teacher must be as much of a professional as the Chemistry or Mathematics teacher, trained in a special manner for the teaching of English. Grammar should not be stressed overly much lest boys quickly lose interest. Fordham Prep gets around this problem by giving a course in word study to incoming Freshmen.

Father Ayd deplored the fact that there seemed to be no adequate set of texts which satisfied both the literature and writing aspects of the course. The Macmillan *Arts and Skills* series is being dropped in Maryland after several years' trial. Our challenge is to provide a program for the need of our schools, not to borrow programs from the textbooks. The program should not be made to fit the text, but a text should be selected to fit our program. Reference was made to the mid-West interprovince English Committee which, under the direction of Father Thomas Curry of Rockhurst High School, has produced a tentative program. Father Ayd recommended the Warriner text (Ginn) as being close to what we should have. It was suggested that Jesuit teachers seem to shy away from the teaching of composition because they have had little training therein during seminary days.

Mathematics. Father John McDonald, principal of Xavier High School in New York, insisted that there be close liaison between the Math and Science departments of our schools in the area of curriculum development, and, in the same area, among grammar schools, high schools and colleges. He then read the program statements to provoke discussion.

During the discussion period, Father McDonald said that, although our graduates regret not having had calculus, many colleges prefer that the subject not be taught in high school. Colleges want entering students to have had at least Algebra II and Trigonometry. A boy with three years of Math does not seem to be under a handicap when he takes the College Board exams. Bellarmine Prep (San Jose) and Jesuit High (El Paso) both reported satisfaction with programmed texts in Mathematics.

Science. Father Carl Kloster, principal of Rockhurst High School in Kansas City, stated that the new approach to Science is clearly an improvement over traditional approaches. The place of science in our curriculum can now be justified, not only by current demands of society, but also by a strong humanistic component for which the new approach provides opportunity. Biology, Chemistry and Physics should be offered, with every student required to take one of these, most required to take two.

In reply to a question, it was recalled that Father Joseph Musselman recommended the CHEM Study approach in his remarks at Santa Clara as being best for our Chemistry students. Xavier (New York) has found the PSSC course unsatisfactory and is thinking of replacing it with the program being developed at M.I.T. Jesuit High (Tampa) has found plastic 35 mm. slide viewers suitable substitutes for microscopes in the Biology course. These inexpensive viewers and their companion slides are manufactured by National Teaching Aids of Garden City, Long Island. Their use, however, would be impractical in any but the traditional Biology approach. A sample viewer and slides will be sent free upon request. It was suggested that all schools be on the mailing list of the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study for the *BSCS Newsletter*. Subscription is free upon request. The address: BSCS, University of Colorado, Box 930, Boulder, Colorado 80301. The same University sponsors a program in Earth Science.

Religion. Father John Sullivan, Director of Education for the Chicago Province, explained the change-over in the approach to the teaching of Religion which has occurred during the past few years, from something polemic to kerygmatic, from a personal to a social spirituality. Two Jesuit-authored texts are currently in use about the country, one (Novak) published by Holt, Rinehart and Winston, the other (Link) by Loyola Press. One teacher who uses

both texts has found that the latter has an appeal to boys of varying intellectual competence, the former only to the brighter students. Father Sullivan insisted that our best teachers be assigned to Religion and that more class time be given the subject. Only thus will the course gain its due prestige.

Discussion revealed that many teachers find the kerygmatic approach too theoretical. It was suggested that a Religion Honors Program be established in our schools along the lines of the Advanced Placement programs. Campion is now offering a seminar-reading program in the field. The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Loyola (Chicago) strongly endorses the idea of an AP Program in Religion and would give credit on the basis of an achievement test. It was mentioned that articulation between high school and college in Religion was extremely poor. The five-year experience with the Novak series at Fordham Prep has convinced some that the series is too theoretical and as open to as much criticism as older texts. This is particularly true on the eleventh and twelfth grade levels. It was also mentioned that older priests tend to teach Religion according to the old approach while using one of the new texts. One danger with using the Novak text, it was pointed out, is that of turning it into a history book.

Social Studies. Father Eugene O'Brien, principal of Fordham Prep School, complained that Social Studies have not received the attention in Jesuit high schools that they should. A Social Studies program should be worked out jointly by high school and college personnel, and it should be taught as a humanistic discipline, not simply as a catalogue of events. Father O'Brien thought that History could best be taught by assigned readings and discussion groups. Geography should be taught, but on a more sophisticated level than in grammar school. He suggested the following sequence: one semester of Geography, three semesters of World History and two semesters of American History. As a Senior, a student should be able to take a course of his own choosing, e.g., Economics. The "cultural approach" to History is not proper for high school students because they are not sufficiently adult to profit from it.

It was suggested in discussion that, since American History is fresh in a boy's mind when he enters high school, we should take advantage of this fact and teach American History in freshman year. It was argued in reply that this would be to throw U.S. History out of its proper chronological sequence. Father O'Brien men-

tioned that Fordham Prep has been very pleased with the Scott-Foresman American History text, *The Democratic Experience*.

Conclusion. At 4:05 PM, the chairman called on Father Bernard Dooley, Director of Secondary Education for the Maryland Province, to give a progress report on preparations for the 1966 Los Angeles Workshop on the Christian Formation of the High School Student of which he is Director.

PROCEEDINGS
AUGUST 1964 SANTA CLARA
HIGH SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS'
INSTITUTE

now available in JEA Central Office

342 pages . . . \$5.00 plus postage

A Citation to Reverend Arthur V. Shea, S.J.

The Jesuit Educational Association takes note this evening of a singular, perhaps a unique anniversary. We honor Father Arthur V. Shea, S.J. for the forty years of rare dedication and distinction which he has given to the office of Prefect of Discipline, the office which he stills holds at Fordham Preparatory School on this campus.

This year of Our Lord 1965 is a year of many anniversaries for Father Shea: this May he will attain the biblical three score and ten in age, in September he will celebrate fifty golden years as a companion of Christ in the Society, and on the Ides of March past he completed forty years of teaching young wills the strength of discipline. Of these forty years, one was spent at St. Joseph's Prep as Prefect of Discipline, one was spent at Fordham College as Assistant Dean of Men, and thirty-eight years have been spent at Fordham Prep as Prefect of Discipline.

There are *many* ways to know Arthur Shea. *Most of us* here tonight have come to know his wisdom through his perceptive pen; his widely read, even more widely re-read articles on the training of the adolescent boy are Assistancy treasures. They have appeared across the years in the *Jesuit Education Quarterly*, the *Sacred Heart Messenger*, *The Catholic World*, and other periodicals. We share with you the good news that these articles have been collected, together with some as yet unpublished material, and they will shortly appear in a book entitled "A Dean of Boys Writes . . ." These all-knowing, compassionate and humor-filled pieces have been used by not a few professors of education in their teacher-training courses.

Many *Fordham Jesuits* know Arthur Shea for his faithful gift of himself to community life, for his never-failing good humor and wall-to-wall laugh, for his long years of generosity in saying Mass and hearing confessions for local communities of religious, and for his quiet, inconspicuous, prayer-filled life.

Ten slow-learning Principals of Fordham Prep have known his patient understanding of their needs and moods; perhaps they more than any others have experienced his depth of wisdom, his evenness of temperament, his humble willingness to share the burdens of his brethren.

Two generations of teachers have learned volumes about the subject called Boys by spending a quiet half-hour now and then in Father Shea's spartan office just inside the front door of Hughes

Hall; teachers have learned to smile there again, because that office is filled with warm laughter more than with anything else.

Parents have come to know Father Shea and, in knowing him, they have found themselves in his office—both physically and in another way—they have understood themselves in their sons a little better, for often enough this “formidable” prefect of discipline has noticed a remarkable resemblance between son and father (often as not the very father who was once a teen-age son on the carpet in that office twenty-five years before). Parents have heard him open each school year with a favorite theme (“Boys become men because they learn to do things they find hard and don’t like to do”), and at several graduations they have come to know the respect in which Arthur Shea is held when the last and heartiest ovation of the evening is given to him by the boys he has fashioned into men.

But most of all, *boys* know Father Shea; in fact, you really have to be a boy to know all there is to know about him! You have to be a boy to feel the awe of your first day at the Prep when you find out that Father Shea has been here since before you were born, maybe even before your father was born—they say he even planted the ivy which holds up the walls! You have to be a boy passionately dedicated to justice (as all boys are, at least in their own case) to know just how incredibly fair this man always is; you have to be a boy in a sulk on a rainy afternoon to know how this man can make you laugh at yourself again; you have to be a boy with a fiendishly forgetful (or maybe just plain fiendish) memory to know how even-tempered this man can be, how like unto Gibraltar without a trace of impatience or anger; you have to be like all boys—clever, quick, inventive and one step ahead of adults—to know the surprise and the wonder of finding Father Shea in the last place you would have ever expected him to be! You have to be one of the “old boys” to know the thrill it is when you come back to the Prep on any afternoon and find him still watching his jug line tramp endlessly around the quadrangle. But you don’t really know Father Shea until you meet him at an alumni reception and see his smile light up with the remembrance of the years which you spent together training you! You don’t really know this man until you can smile at yourself as he did!

The Jesuit Educational Association honors itself in honoring one who has been so fine a Jesuit, so wise a teacher and so inspiring a man these forty years in our schools. Perhaps the best words about

that kind of work are those which he himself appended to an article which he wrote over ten years ago:

"It is hard to leave this subject of high school boys. When school closes in June you are glad it is closed. You do not want to see all those boys again until September. However, if you spend your summer among adults and some day during the summer a boy crosses your path, you find that something has happened. You have begun to miss the boys! The sight of one of them has given you such a thrill that you realize that a life away from boys can be very dull. The job of being a prefect of discipline is not too bad after all."

Thank you, Father Arthur V. Shea, for doing that job so superlatively well these forty years—May you have many more Septembers!

The Meaning of a Liberal Education in Our Times

HERBERT MUSURILLO, S.J.

It would be surprising if I did not feel a certain diffidence in standing before you to make an attempt to define the limits and scope of a liberal education today. A long line of writers and philosophers have gone before me, stretching back to Aristotle and Plato: for it was indeed the Greeks, as in so many things besides, who first conceived and developed the western concept of *paideia*, or the transmission of a cultural heritage. For the problem of education does not arise until man has become sufficiently aware of his position in the world and in the history of ideas, such that an intellectual grasp of his cultural achievement is considered as one of the highest of human values. Education for the Greeks was the cultivation of the mind by the study of philosophy, literature, mathematics, and music. Indeed, the leisure to indulge the mind in such studies was considered by Aristotle to be the goal of human existence.

The early Church inherited the Greek concept of education from the Platonists and especially through the influence of the Alexandrian school. For Origen the *en kuklô paideia*, or rounded training in all the arts, was felt to be an essential preparation for an understanding of the Scriptures and the Christian revelation. For, in the primitive Church, the study of the arts and sciences was never undertaken for their own sake, or purely for the development of the mind and the transmission of a cultural heritage. Indulgence in philosophy, literature, or the arts, was almost always thought of as a despoiling of the Egyptians, an invasion of the enemies' arsenal to secure the weapons of attack and defence. Indeed, the withdrawal of so many of the early Christians to the desert represented a mood that was prevalent: the structures of this world were but passing, and were doomed to be replaced by a higher wisdom that made mock of the foolishness of the universities.

It was especially the Latin Church, under men of vision like Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome, that was to revolt against such a narrow view of secular culture. Augustine, who taught literature in Africa, was at constant pains to stress the two roads to God:

the one through the symbols of the Scriptures and the other through the knowledge of the world from the arts and sciences. Both ways lead to Christ: for truth, he said, is one. Fortunately for the western church, Cassiodorus attempted to set up in Italy a monastery of learning with Origen's school at Alexandria as its model; and for guidance in studies, Cassiodorus followed the inspiration of "*pater Augustinus*," in allowing ample time for the secular disciplines from grammar to astronomy. This, indeed, was the ideal of education which was preserved in the West by the Benedictine and other monastic schools, and eventually spread to all the universities of Europe: it was fundamentally the *trivium* and *quadrivium* (the nucleus of the liberal arts) capped by scholastic philosophy and theology. This was the curriculum which was to endure throughout the middle ages and the Renaissance as the most suited to produce the educated men of the ruling classes: the hierarchy, the lawyers, the politicians, and the teachers.

It was thus relying on this ancient tradition that the Society of Jesus in the sixteenth century developed its own liberal code of education embodied in the various *Rationes studiorum*, in a way that was to change the course of secondary education for centuries to come.¹

In the United States it was the Jesuit college that established Catholic university education on a level comparably unknown in Europe, and indirectly brought about the famous decree of the Baltimore Synod, which created an inseparable gulf between the American Catholic and non-Catholic university. The story of Jesuit higher education in America begins with Georgetown, Fordham, St. Louis, and Holy Cross. Here the early curriculum, established at Georgetown by Fr. John Grassi,² and imitated to an extent by others, reflects the desire to make the Catholic liberal arts program conform to the requirements of the Jesuit seminary, with its stress on poetry, rhetoric, logic, philosophy, and theology. But even Harvard University in the seventeenth century found no better solution to the American problem, and its early curricula stress the importance of Greek and Latin and other subjects essential for the training of Protestant divinity students.³

¹ See W. J. McGucken, *The Jesuits and Education* (Milwaukee, 1932); and cf. also John Donahue, *Jesuit Education* (New York, 1963), especially pp. 63 ff.

² See, for example, John M. Daley, *Georgetown University: Origin and Early Years* (Washington, 1957), pp. 169 ff., with sources cited.

³ See S. E. Morison, *Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century: Part I* (Cambridge, Mass., 1936), 138 ff.

The concept of a liberal education in the United States became confused precisely because of the peculiar nature of early American education. For the newly independent republic early diverged from the European tradition of the secondary school as preparation for the university—the system upon which the Jesuit *Ratio studiorum* had been grafted. The need for the long (eventually eight-year) elementary schooling in the three R's in various parts of the growing republic created the unwieldy 8-4-4 system of education; and equivalently made the four years of college a prolongation of the high school, instead of what it was intended to be in Europe, a university for the training of competence in the professional and academic fields. In Europe it was the secondary school (of four to six or seven years) that offered a general training in literature and languages, the sciences and philosophy. Thus the university could presume that the fundamental groundwork had been covered and could therefore restrict itself to a truly professional training, without worrying about the problem of a liberal education. It is on this premise that the great universities of Europe are structured today, in England, France, Italy, and Germany. What we should call a general, liberal curriculum is restricted to more elementary levels; whereas from about the age of eighteen on is considered the proper time for study of a subject area in depth with a view towards an academic degree. And this is, I submit, the correct view: to continue into the later college years with required subjects in which a student is not professionally interested is to impart a superficial training, and to prolong the period of adolescence to no purpose.

Thus I am convinced that the search for the definition of a truly liberal education is an illusion, a search for a will-o-the-wisp. What we are really looking for is a certain habit of mind, a deepened awareness, an intellectual and emotional openness, which considers the life of man on earth as a spiritual adventure, and not merely as a job, a chore, or (worse still) a biological mistake. But such an attitude of mind is not linked inevitably to any rigid curriculum or system of courses, no matter how excellent in themselves; it is, if anything, the result of a truly serious academic atmosphere, where students can come in contact with scholars of depth and intelligence, no matter what the subject. In fact, in the state of modern knowledge, it would seem preposterous that we Jesuits or anyone else should have the right to define the scope of a liberal education—save that it is one that is truly open, and allows the

individual every opportunity to seek God, and the Truth, through all the available resources of the modern university. Individual colleges can, of course, specify the limits of the various degrees which they offer: in literature, philosophy, the sciences, mathematics, sociology, economics, and so on. On each track the subjects required should be imposed only by consultation with specialists in each field. On each level, students might in general be required to have a grasp of at least one language (ancient or modern) other than their native one. In a Catholic university, of course, each track should somehow culminate in at least one comprehensive course in Catholic theology. But other than this, there need be no other requirements outside of the individual field. This is my profile of the truly liberal education at the Catholic university of the future. For with good students and first-class teachers, we do not have to clutter up our curricular offerings with too many required courses outside of the specific field of endeavor, in a mistaken effort to preserve some image of what the "liberal arts product" should look like. Universities are not factories; they are rather, in a Platonic sense, *phrontistéria* or "thinking-halls," where there is no magic formula to success save the proper and disciplined use of the human mind.

In present-day America it would seem wrong to impose a mandatory curriculum or legislate for all Jesuit colleges and universities in different parts of the country. Even in the early days of the Society, for example, the Jesuit curriculum at St. Louis differed from that at Georgetown and old Fordham—and Jesuits wrote to the General to complain of the discrepancy. But today, surely, we realize that Jesuit education stands or falls not so much on its subject matter (we may presume this will be solid) but rather on its goals, its methods, its spiritual motivation, and its Catholic loyalty. Where the approach is serious and the goals unlimited, there can be no fear that our students will not be liberally educated.

What I am proposing is a new, tough-minded approach to Jesuit education, which at least on the college level will not be bound by any apriori concept of a liberal arts curriculum. The British philosopher Locke, whose treatises on education had a wide influence both within and outside of the Church, constantly stressed the central importance of thinking, of reasoning, in the training of youth. This was, indeed, heavily emphasized in the early Jesuit curricula; but perhaps with the modern American stress on shallow thinking over a wide range of subjects and a kind of mislabeled,

democratic conformity, we too have lost sight of the fundamental purpose of education on the pre-professional, pre-university level. Locke, in speaking of this, says:⁴

Few men are from their youth accustomed to strict reasoning, and to trace the dependence of any truth in a long train of consequences to its remotest principles . . . Would you have a man write or paint, dance or fence well . . . let him have ever so much vigor and activity, suppleness and address naturally, yet nobody expects this from him unless he has been used to it and has employed time and pains. Just so it is in the mind, would you have a man reason well, you must use him to it betimes, exercise his mind in observing the connexion of ideas, and following them in train.

If we understand Locke to be speaking here of the mind in its widest sense, I think he has expressed precisely what is the task of the Jesuit educator. For once we have taught our students to become fully aware of their mental processes, to exercise them diligently, and to begin to use the sources, material, and equipment which must assist them in their search for truth, no matter what the field, we have achieved the greatest single goal of Jesuit education.

Again, we must always bear in mind that this search is, at least at the earlier stages, a creative-collaborative process. For, in the kind of education I am thinking of, no amount of equipment can replace the vital relationship which should exist between teacher and student. A high school teacher I once knew spent most of his class time discussing or recommending books he had just read; he recommended everything, and in fact we liked his classes because we had few assignments and covered little of the term's matter in class. Interesting character he may have been; but he was no teacher, and he would have been better employed at the Public Library. Again, it is a common fallacy for deans and headmasters to show off to visiting inspectors their array of visual aids, the latest equipment, TV, splendid library facilities, and the new gym. But my question has always been: where are the teachers, what has been their training and background, how good are they, are they encouraged, and are they well-paid? The good school must be chiefly known by the splendid, productive tension that exists between faculty and student. If this is present, all else is secondary; but

⁴ *The Conduct of the Understanding*, 6, as quoted in John Locke, *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* (ed. R. H. Quick, Cambridge, 1934), p. 225.

without *dialektikê*, that dynamic dialogue between men, there is no education that is worthy of the name.

I am well aware that American society, on the whole, tends to suspect this kind of education. We have not yet emerged from a mythological stage of thinking, in which our gods are still the idols of the market-place, and our heroes are those who have, like Hercules of old, reached an apotheosis of affluence without the benefit of books. In short, if we may trust the impressions of recent writers, the real impact on American society is made by the wealthy financier, the politician, the journalist, and the educator—in just about that order. But there are, fortunately, faint stirrings abroad that suggest we are in a process of change. Our college population has swelled disproportionately, there is a growing interest in music, philosophy, and the arts, even among the culturally deprived and underprivileged. But let us not be deceived: much of the current fascination with higher education and the arts is often little more than the expression of a status symbol. The situation is discouraging for the professional educator; but our young people are largely products of their environment, and we can hardly expect them to be otherwise. At the same time, there is a growing trend among our own Jesuit high school and college students to take music, the arts, drama, and the film seriously. It is a trend to be encouraged, I think, even though it may exist only among the minority.

And what of the status of our Jesuit high schools in the modern world? They are, surely, among the best secondary schools in the country. And the secret of their high standard is very simple: it is due to the superb teaching and direction on the part of our high school faculties, both Jesuit and lay. In my view, expert teaching is the one indispensable asset of the Jesuit code of liberal education, and I should be prepared to scrap almost every other educational theory—provided we might retain teachers that are of the highest calibre and show a genuine desire to train young men of high school age. Indeed, I think that we should lay it down as a principle that no change should be attempted on the academic level without serious consultation with teachers of proven competence. For the good high school teacher is the keystone of our entire system. Rare as precious metal, he should be developed, encouraged, and (above all) made aware of his crucial position in the whole Jesuit scheme of training.

If there is any fault to be mentioned, the most glaring one is perhaps that our Jesuit students are over-directed, such that not enough

allowance is made for self-development, personal genius or creativity, especially in the area of literature, the humanities and the arts. If teaching is at the core of our system, our students must also learn to study, grow and develop on their own, to develop powers of critical analysis, and not feel that they must loyally subscribe to all the personal views, likes and dislikes of their teachers. It is a commonplace to say that our student body represents a wide spectrum of talent and temperament: let it not be said that Jesuit education works best only with certain specified types of youngsters, with those, that is, that it can set into a preconceived kind of mould. The true hallmark of a liberal education is the development of the mind in all its manifold creativity, to the point where it can grow and mature on its own. Good grapes can blossom and mature despite the trellis that is needed only at the outset. Let us not make the mistake of keeping our maturing students too closely under surveillance to the point of discouraging personal initiative and originality. Only an insecure mother is afraid of leaving her children occasionally free to wander off on their own.

And what are we to say of the high school curriculum? We cannot here enter into detail; nor would it be proper to lay down norms for schools so different in geographical environment. But, as I earlier suggested, the older idea of the Jesuit code of liberal education applied primarily to the high school: for it was here that a generalized curriculum could be offered before entrance into the professional life of the university. It is a period when the many-sided potential of our young students must be allowed to find its proper direction, so that by the time of college they may be fairly certain of what they are suited for.

Our high schools have, of course, the duty of preparing our young men for their College Boards. Again, with the rising trend towards Advanced Placement, we must remind ourselves of the necessity of a taut liaison between our colleges and the high schools that feed them. A certain lack of collaboration is, I fear, one of the glaring defects of Jesuit education in the United States at the present time.

Above all, we must beware of experimenting with our students. New methods of teaching should not be rashly introduced. I know of one high school (not a Jesuit one) where three different methods of teaching a subject were enforced on the same class within the space of a few years—with lasting damage to these students when they attempted to resume the same subject on the college level.

Further, we should not be too quick to change our courses to fit the latest theories. Our high schools enjoy, at the moment, an excellent record in this country. Let us beware of doing anything to jeopardize this high level of achievement. High schools for example, that offer four years of Latin with some Greek ought by all means to continue the practice (but if we are to continue our four years of Latin, the course offerings must be drastically modernized and brought up to date). Simply because of recent liturgical changes, we as educators must not be so shortsighted as to neglect the cultural and linguistic advantages of the ancient languages. Still, those students that show an obvious weakness in languages, with a compensating talent in other directions, might be excused after three years of Latin. Common sense teaches us that we cannot force everyone into humanities on the one hand or into a science-math program on the other. Indeed, the present trend in some high schools can perhaps prove disastrous: for some students coming out of high-school science courses completely underestimate the demands of the college programs, and might have been better advised to major in one of the humanities. The recent *Report of the Commission on the Humanities* for the American Council of Learned Societies⁵ has demonstrated the vast number of possibilities for competent students in this area; perhaps an overemphasis on scientific careers has given young students a false impression of the facts. In any case, it is our job in high school and college to see that talent is properly channelled and directed, and we ought not jeopardize a student's career because of a subjective idea of what the liberal or fully "rounded" curriculum should be. Above all we must be on the alert to utilize the potential of our especially talented students and show an enlightened attitude in our direction of all of them through high school and college years.⁶ It may be that we should, in our better high schools, adopt the non-graded system, sending our students on to college when they are ready for it—even after three years.

Finally, though we should not be resistant to change, let us remain calm in the midst of the unreasonable attacks that have been launched against the entire structure of Jesuit and Catholic education, theology and philosophy, even by those within our own

⁵ Published by the ACLS, New York, 1964; see especially the remarks on pp. 20-30.

⁶ For this section, see also the shrewd remarks of R. A. Bernert, *JEQ* 27, no. 1 (June, 1964), 15-27, especially on the lack of articulation between the Jesuit college and high school. I should, however, be more wary than Fr. Bernert on the suitability of many of the changes which he seems to approve of on the high school level.

ranks. Above all, whatever changes may be deemed necessary—and these will be many—we must ensure that the great ideals of Jesuit education will not be destroyed (or the minds of our students warped by either cynical or inadequate instruction on the high school or college level. No matter what our differences in theory or approach, Jesuit superiors and administrators must take decisive steps to ensure that the role of Catholic education is in no way undermined within our own lecture halls.

The Jesuit system of education is based upon the wisdom, prudence, skill, and holiness of the individual teacher.⁷ For this, after all, is the meaning of a truly liberal education: it is the acquisition of wisdom through competence in a legitimate field of human enquiry, under the guidance of expert and sympathetic teachers. This kind of education, based on the primacy of expert instruction, is nothing less than our Catholic students expect and deserve. And it is the sort of *paideia* that Plato, Augustine, and Ignatius Loyola—despite the vast curricular changes—would recognize as their own. There is no greater legacy that we can offer the growing youth of America. And to deprive them of it would be to inflict irreparable harm.

⁷ Relevant here are the remarks in "The Flight from Teaching," *The Annual Report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*, 1963-4 (New York), especially the conclusions, pp. 13-14.

Is There Anything Distinctive About Jesuit Education?

WILLIAM D. RYAN, S.J.

Jesuit Education is understood here to refer to the work done in schools and universities by members of the Society of Jesus who have been trained in the manner usual for members of the Society and who adhere to traditional principles and practices mentioned in Jesuit sources. Whether the claims herein made may be applicable to the lay teachers in Jesuit institutions is not considered.

The claim is made here that there is something distinctive but that it is the result of a combination of factors and elements. The first of these is the fact that the men who become Jesuits have the willingness to be trained according to the spirit and prescriptions of the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus and the Rules of the Society. In the process of becoming formed according to the Constitutions and the Rules of the Society the members make use of the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius. The result of all of these elements or forces is a dedicated man with a definite religious spirit and orientation. Jesuit spirituality is not Dominican or Franciscan or any other. These members then approach their ministries with distinctive attitudes and spirit. Educational work is one of these ministries; ideally each Jesuit brings to this work the result of training in a distinctive way of life. Fundamentally he is motivated by the love of God and of the neighbor, which can be had by any religiously minded individual. But he does have his distinctive attitude, outlook, means of motivation.

The next factor or element in the combination that makes Jesuit Education distinctive consists in the instrumentalities that members of the Society have in their educational work. The original source of these for the members of the Society is contained in the fourth part of their Constitutions. St. Ignatius is the author of the Constitutions. He wrote in addition many suggestions and directives; some of his early companions did likewise, since they were actively engaged in the educational work of the new Society. Many of these suggestions and directives were incorporated in the *Ratio Studiorum* of 1599.

The *Ratio* is not for the present generation of members of the Society the definitive document it was in their early history. But there are elements in the *Ratio* that have become part of the Jesuit

heritage in educational work. Of course, it should be pointed out that the close-knit organization provided by the Constitutions of the Society remains still, and that was and is part of the distinctive quality of Jesuit Education.

When we seek distinctive elements in the *Ratio* we note that planning and adaptation are discernible. There was a program that grounded students solidly in grammar; there was a distribution of classes according to the capacities of the students, each class having a distinct work to accomplish; there was progression in studies from the lowest class of grammar to the ideal of perfect eloquence hopefully achieved in the class of Rhetoric. These classes were to be taken one at a time and in order. The students were expected to be assiduous in attendance at classes and there would be no mere scattering of lectures according to the inclination of the teachers, the custom of the locality, or the whim of the students. Abundance of exercises were to accompany the lessons. These and possibly other directives were contained in the *Ratio* and may be considered as part of the continuing legacy from the Society of the early centuries. These ideas have been treated by our writers who have concerned themselves with Jesuit educational practice through the years. These ideas can be a common possession of all of the members of the Society. I believe that they are a common possession of administrators and teachers in our Jesuit schools and colleges.

A late and definitive document exists for the members of the Society in the American Assistancy. It is the *Instructio* of 1934, revised in 1948. This identifies some of the elements that should mark Jesuit educational work in the United States in our times. This material is found in Titulus II, Art. 7, pp. 13, 14. In part it reads as follows:

“. . . ea quae Instituti nostri et scholarum nostrarum sunt essentialia et propria, quaeque semper et ubique in praxim deduci debent, qualia sunt imprimis:

1. Finis educationis nostrae praestitutus: i.e., proximum ad Dei cognitionem atque amorem adducere, etc.
2. Media quaedam peculiaria, ad hanc educationem conducentia:
 - a. Instructio religiosa . . .
 - b. Philosophia Scholastica . . .

- c. Saecularis nostra docendi methodus, quae non solam eruditionem intendit, sed id praesertim ut totus homo cum omnibus facultatibus rite formetur et evolvat;
- d. Personalis alumnorum cura, qua Nostri, praeter doctrinam et exemplum in scholis praesertim, singulos consilio et exhortatione dirigere et adjuvare satagant."

I would contend that there is something distinctive about Jesuit Education and that it consists in a combination of elements. Today the Constitutions of the Society and its Rules remain substantially what they have been through the ages; the type of spirituality imbibed by the members of the Society is essentially unchanged and the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius are still instruments in the cultivation of that spirituality. Members therefore still approach the ministry of educational work with the same Ignatian attitude, outlook, and motivation. There is the same government in the Society and close-knit organization that can energize and direct men and instrumentalities in their educational work. And there is a heritage in instrumentalities that have been associated with Jesuit Education all through the years. It is this combination of elements that makes Jesuit Education distinctive. No other group possesses this combination of elements.

News from the Field

A former Milwaukee industrialist, C. Frederic (Todd) Wehr has given MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY a gift of \$2,250,000 to establish the Wehr Science Center. The over two million dollar gift is the largest Marquette has received as a single gift and is believed to be the highest single philanthropic contribution to a college or university in the State of Wisconsin. Marquette will use the gift to help build a chemistry building, to set up an endowment fund for the building and to endow two professorships in chemistry and physics.

SANTA CLARA is building an eleven story dormitory for male students. The building which will be in the former parking lot between Dunne Hall and the Campus Center will house 460 students. It is hoped that the dormitory will be ready for September 1966 occupancy.

Both SCRANTON UNIVERSITY and ST. JOSEPH'S COLLEGE are grateful to anonymous donors for gifts of \$100,000 dollars. The Scranton donation is on the basis of a matching gift of \$1 for every \$2 raised by the Alumni Program. The St. Joseph's gift is incidentally the largest single gift received by anonymous donation in the 113 years of the college and will be used for development.

According to recent figures the GEORGETOWN SCHOOL OF LAW is the fifth largest in the nation. With an enrollment of 1,220 students, GU Law outnumbers all the nation's law schools except New York University, Harvard, Texas and Brooklyn. A recent experiment at the Law School has been the Legal Intern Program whereby indigent persons are represented by selected graduate students to assure protection of their constitutional rights.

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY announces that construction bids have been awarded for the start of the Busch Memorial Center. Construction of the Student Center is expected to take 21 months. Total cost will be in the neighborhood of \$3,250,000. The Center is a four level building housing a number of facilities including cafeteria and private and faculty dining rooms, chapel and the usual recreational facilities of a building of this type.

WHEELING COLLEGE has arranged through CIT Educational Buildings, Inc. for the construction and lease of one dormitory housing 48 women students and two other dormitories housing a total of 96 men students.

Other schools might be interested in this CIT plan since the essential is a leasing agreement which gives colleges the opportunity to obtain much needed student housing without making any down payment or tying up their funds in any way. According to a brochure, issued by the company, the essence of the plan is that standard room rentals, approximating those charged to students occupying other rooms on the same campus, should be sufficient to cover all rental payments in the lease as well as to provide income for the college for building services and maintenance costs.

CIT Educational Building is a subsidiary of the CIT Financial Corporation of New York which many educators know through another CIT subsidiary, Tuition Plan, Inc.

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY will be proceeding apace with a \$1,400,000. federal grant for Lincoln Center construction awarded under the Higher Educational Facilities Act.

Fordham was also notified that it would be eligible for a \$400,000. grant in September 1965.

The next phase of the development of the Lincoln Square Center will include a nine story multi-purpose building to house the schools of Education, Business, Social Service and General Studies.

Another major factor in financing the Lincoln Square construction will be realized through a \$8 million bond issue, scheduled for the Fall 1965, through the auspices of the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York.

BOSTON COLLEGE'S five under-graduate schools have pledged a senior gift of \$203,000. The senior campaign received support from 74 percent of the graduates. The average contribution was \$235. The gift, believed to be the largest made at any college or university this year by seniors is earmarked for the proposed new library facilities on the Boston College campus.

ROCKHURST COLLEGE according to present plans will break ground for two new structures by September of 1965. The \$900,000 library building and the \$950,000 student residence hall are expected to be completed by the Fall Semester of 1966.

GREEK held the stage for both Holy Cross College students and Boston College High School students in their recent public exhibitions. In the Holy Cross program held on May 16, 1965 of the 13 Holy Cross students participating it is interesting to note that 12 of the students were from Jesuit high schools. The Jesuit high schools represented by their graduates were Loyola Academy, Wilmette, Boston College High, Fordham Prep, Scranton Prep, Champion Prep, Regis High of New York, Bellarmine High of Tacoma, St. Ignatius, Chicago and St. Peter's of Jersey City. The general area of the exhibition was on the work of Aristophanes.

The Boston College High School students displayed their knowledge of the works of Homer in the *Odyssey*. The exhibition was a two hour exhibition in which each boy was responsible for all of the 24 books of the *Odyssey*.

Regis High of New York is due to have a Homeric Academy soon which is quite similar to the Boston College High exhibition but no details have been received on the Regis High exhibition.

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY plans to open a University Center in Madrid in the Fall of 1965. This cooperative venture with the University of Madrid, Spain, represents an extension of the Junior year abroad program which Marquette has had for the past six years.

Under the present plan students who have finished the equivalent of two years of college Spanish will be eligible. Students will participate in an intensive six weeks conversation course in the Spanish language on the Madrid campus prior to the start of the regular academic year. During the year students will meet in small groups for special tutoring sessions in each course subject. The general cost for the year including the tuition, room and board, books and supplies has been estimated at about \$1,600.

BOSTON COLLEGE has broken ground for a five-story Science Center which will house the departments of biology and physics.

The present Devlin Hall now housing all four departments of science will eventually be converted to the use of chemistry and geology alone.

The new facilities will contain 16 teaching laboratories, 33 research laboratories, 10 classrooms, auditoriums, seminar rooms and 40 offices. Closed circuit television will be installed throughout the building.

UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT is preparing to build a Life-Science building. The total cost of the building will be close to \$2 million but a loan of \$1,450,000 has been granted through the Higher Education Facilities Act.

The structure will actually be a complex of three buildings containing laboratory units and classrooms.

School of Bishops? . . . HOLY CROSS has recently released a list which shows they can lay proud claim to being the alma mater of 28 bishops. Four of the 28 bishops are living at the present time: Bishop Frederick Donaghy, now in Formosa, Bishop Daniel Feeney of Portland, Maine, Bishop Bernard Flanagan of Worcester, Mass., and Bishop Edward Maginn, Auxiliary of Albany, N.Y.

CHRISTIAN WISDOM AND CHRISTIAN FORMATION, edited by Father J. Barry McGannon, S.J., is the volume resulting from the Los Angeles Workshop on Philosophy and Theology. It is published by Sheed and Ward and is obtainable at your book shop. The cost of the volume is \$6.00. Copies of Volume V, the final volume of the Workshop containing the final resumes and position papers is still available at the JEA Central Office at \$5.00 a copy.

CAMPION PREP is planning on opening its new senior dormitory for September of 1965. The \$900,000 building will contain 64 rooms on the second and third floors. A feature which the senior students will probably view very dimly allows the prefect to call or listen in on individual rooms. The beds will convert into sofas during the day.

CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY broke ground for two three-and-a-half million structures. Both dormitories are named after generous benefactors. Kiewit Hall, a ten story building will house 506 women students. It will also include a two story dining room extension connecting with Gallagher Hall, another five story women's residence hall. Swanson Hall, the ten story male residence dormitory, will house 704 male students. Both dormitories are financed on long term loans.

REGIS COLLEGE has plans for summer building. Construction will start on a new library building and a new science hall. Both are hoped to be ready by the opening of school in September of '66.

